

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

DR. TEMPLE, the Archbishop of York, delivered last year a course of four lectures at the College of Preachers at Washington, which are now published under the title of *The Preacher's Theme To-Day* (S.P.C.K. ; 2s. 6d. net).

The lectures deal with Revelation, the Incarnation, Sin and Atonement, Christianity, Ethics and Politics. Of these perhaps the most striking is the first.

Dr. TEMPLE regards the question of Revelation as being 'the centre of the most important of all theological problems of our time.' The reason of this is that the prevailing philosophy of our time denies expressly or by implication the possibility of genuine revelation in the Christian sense. We have got rid of the materialism which was known in the end of the nineteenth century, and this is 'undoubtedly a very great gain for the presentation of the Christian faith.' But in its place we are now met by a philosophy 'which uses spiritual language and aims at preserving what it has become our custom to call spiritual values, but which has been disposed to take over from the old kind of materialism a sense of reality as a closed system in which every part depends upon every other part in the scheme of the whole, so that the principle of reality itself, the ultimate power, whether called God or not, is thought of as guiding all events but truly revealing itself in no one event.' In this philosophy, while mind has its recognized place, it is really made

subordinate to matter. It is regarded as being active only in response to a material situation, and its actions are all to be completely accounted for, like physical events, in terms of cause and effect.

In opposition to this philosophy it is vitally important for us to maintain the distinction between causes and reasons. Our action in any given case is no doubt influenced by many causes arising out of our inherited dispositions, our education, environment, and so forth, but no one in accounting for his action would simply give a recital of these. On the contrary, he would speak of the future, of some end to be gained, of some good to be done. In a word, he would give reasons. So then we must claim that 'there exist in the world beings, namely, ourselves, of such a kind as to act by reasons and not by causes.' For this conception no form of materialism makes any allowance, however little in actual practice the materialist may be able to maintain his consistency. Here is the fundamental point of difference between a materialistic and a spiritual philosophy.

Setting aside materialism and turning to examine types of spiritual philosophy we find a further difference emerging. It is the distinguishing mark between Theism and Pantheism. 'Does God take definite and specific action, or is He only in a general sense the source of all that is or happens?' The best Pantheism is very close to Theism, but here there is a clear line of divergence. The great

distinction among men, as Dr. Edwin Bevan is always insisting, is 'not between Eastern and Western, but between those who have come strongly under the influence of the Bible and those who have not.' Pantheism traces its lineage back to the philosophy of ancient Greece which, in profound harmony with the highest Indian thought, conceives God as 'a static perfection, whose nature appears in all things that are grounded in that perfection.' Theism, on the other hand, deriving its thought from the Bible, conceives God as 'a living and righteous will, so that we come closest to Him not when, with our mind, we obtain a wide conspectus of truth, but when in our purposes we are united with His righteous purpose.'

Now there is a great measure of truth in Pantheism. For if there is any revelation at all then everything whatsoever must be revelation, because the Being who is to be revealed is the God of heaven and earth, the Maker of all things, and the character of the Maker must appear to some extent in what He has made. There are, of course, facts which, taken in isolation, would give no true conception of God at all. 'The claim of any one who says that all things in some degree reveal God, must be that if only we could see it in its whole context there would be perceptible in the movement, of which this fact is an episode, at least some trace of the divine character and will. Unless all things are revelation, nothing can be revelation.'

But the question rises whether God is merely the universal immanent principle, or does He take sides? 'Is there any sense in language such as that about coming to the help of the Lord against the mighty? Does that represent anything in the real constitution of the world?' If God is conceived in terms of personality and will, it surely follows that some of those events which we regard as His action will reveal Him much more fully than others. The great man in nine-tenths of his actions would probably be indistinguishable from the average man, but in some emergency his distinction would immediately appear and an altogether new light would be thrown upon his character, his power, and his purposes. If God is truly personal this analogy may

fitly be applied to His action. 'For the most part we must expect to find that the divine action proceeds by a perfectly regular process. It will only be set aside when there is sufficient occasion.' This does not mean that there is a fixed natural process with which we claim that God may interfere from time to time. It rather means that 'all the while He is acting, only all the while it is appropriate on most occasions to follow a regular course, as does the ordinary man of regular habit in the conduct of his daily life. But, where some sufficient emergency occurs, this course can be set aside, because all the while it is grounded not in physical necessity, but in the divine will, or in the divine apprehension of what is good.' Such an emergency, so the Bible teaches, has arisen through the sin of man, and has given rise to a special divine activity or revelation.

The question now arises as to the *locus* of this revelation. We have all, doubtless, freed our minds from the idea that it resides in a series of propositions or in words expressly dictated by the Divine Spirit. But there is an impression that the *locus* of revelation is supremely within the human mind, that 'it comes in the poetic glow wherein the mind is wrapped into a union with the divine, and seeks to utter what it has experienced by those modes of expression which seem to force words to convey something beyond their ordinary meaning.' In this there is no doubt a great measure of truth, but it has this difficulty that poetic apprehension of this sort is always very vague. 'It may stir deeply those who are in sufficient mental sympathy with the poet to enter into his experience as they read his utterances, but a good many people will be left untouched; and there is nothing definite there at all.'

Now, however, we find that the primary interest of the Bible is not in the experience or the doctrine, but in the *event*. The Bible is for the most part a history book. 'The biblical historian is always concerned with the question, What was in the mind of God? But that to which he desires to relate the mind of God is always the event, and I want to suggest to you that on the biblical view the *locus*,

the sphere, the area, of revelation, is primarily the historic event, not thoughts in men's minds at all, but the thing that happens—the deliverance from Egypt, the retreat of Sennacherib, the Exile, and the Return. In these things we are to read the action of God, His purpose, His judgment.' No doubt the event can only be interpreted aright by the mind that is divinely illuminated, as was the prophet's mind. But the divine act comes first, and the prophet is to be regarded not as a man to whom God has communicated certain divine truths, but as one who has been divinely enlightened to interpret the divine act.

All this has a direct and important bearing upon the revelation of Christ in the Gospels. Here the divine fact is that the Word was made flesh. Doubtless that fact would have been barren if there had not been those whose minds were illuminated to receive and understand it. 'We beheld his glory.' But the solid foundation of fact must never be belittled or overlooked. Only a false spirituality will lead us away from the divine act in history to a purely mental illumination or mystical experience. 'Actual and effective revelation takes place when there is a coincidence of the divinely guided event and the divinely illuminated mind, and for the fullness and effectiveness of revelation both factors are necessary.'

What student of theology, what preacher or teacher has not felt—and probably complained—that of all Christian doctrines that of the Holy Spirit is among the most obscure?

It is obscure because it has been so neglected. It received scant and almost superficial attention in the early centuries; the Church asserted the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit mainly as a corollary of the consubstantiality of the Son, but the only problem as to the Godhead which received real attention was that of Father—Son.

In later times the question enlisted attention often enough, but little of real satisfying value was attained. On the one hand, so many of the writers

took positions which seemed wild, unreal, and almost meaningless; on the other hand, more sober writers were under the domination of what had long passed as traditional 'orthodoxy,' so that their often learned disquisitions also seem unreal and not obviously meaningful. They were at pains, for example, to prove that the Holy Spirit is a 'person,' not an influence, but the modern mind asks impatiently what does that mean?

Yes, there is clamant need for a fresh start on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. We make bold to say that the Church to-day is in dire need of it. Who will give us at least the foundations or outline?

We think of Canon C. E. RAVEN. He might conceivably do something of real value here. For the third of his Riddell Memorial Lectures (1935), a series with the general title of *Evolution and the Christian Concept of God* (Milford; 2s. 6d. net), is on 'The Energy of the Spirit,' and in it he shows at least that he is fully alive to the difficulties we all feel and to the vital importance of our coming to some clearer notions as to the Holy Spirit.

He shows how the difficulties arose. They lie in the New Testament itself. We have all noticed how the 'fruits of the Spirit' seem so different from the 'manifestations of the Spirit,' the former being principally ethical and spiritual, the latter being largely matters of 'tongues' and ecstasies and miracles. Whether we are quite prepared to agree with Canon RAVEN's suggestion that St. Luke 'misinterpreted Pentecost' or not, the distinction we have drawn stares us in the face.

Then very convincingly Dr. RAVEN points out how Montanus, who interpreted 'spiritual gifts' in the ecstatic sense, and the 'orthodox' Church, which rightly enough condemned his extravagance, were responsible between them for the unsatisfactory state of things which has existed ever since. For the Church came to believe that the Holy Spirit dwelt only within her bounds; and that belief, he points out, leads almost inevitably to a

quasi-magical view which fails entirely to do justice to any tenable view of the Holy Spirit as revealed in Scripture.

Another unfortunate happening in early days confirmed this tendency to make the Holy Spirit an exclusive possession of the Church. The Alexandrian theology did not distinguish carefully enough between the Logos and the Holy Spirit. It left no real room for the Spirit and kept Him only as the source of special acts of inspiration, so 'lending weight to the tendency to restrict His scope to purely ecclesiastical regions.' 'Any recognition of a divine element outside the Scriptures and the Church' became suspect. The whole natural order was a mass of corruption, the good works of the heathen were only *splendida vitia*.

We must, holds Dr. RAVEN, 'move away from traditional orthodoxy,' 'to recover a lost and vital element in the Christian religion.' 'To do full justice to our faith in the Spirit as the Giver of Life would be at once to connect Him with the whole creative process—with that quest for life and life abundant to which evolution testifies and which Jesus endorsed and consummated.'

Bergson in his 'Creative Evolution' has shown that evolution is a complete mystery apart from some such hypothesis as that of an *élan vital*—an urge, a *nîsus* towards perfection whose operations result in 'emergences' novel and unpredictable. Dr. RAVEN does not suggest that the *élan vital* is to be identified with the Holy Spirit, but he urges that 'no one can fail to be struck by the analogy between the activity of the Life-force and the operations of the Spirit.' 'Bergson's description of the way in which Life insinuates itself into matter, overcomes resistances, moulds it to serve higher ends, and brings with it liberty, variety, and richness of achievement might be transferred almost without change to the operation of the Spirit as described in the Acts of the Apostles.'

That this admits of a dangerous interpretation Canon RAVEN is well aware. But the danger ceases if we hold by the transcendence as well as

the immanence of God. God is more than 'life-force.'

To correlate the Power which leads man in his individual and social nature from lower to higher with the Power which has led the whole animate creation from lower to higher forms, and which in the case of man has led him to his artistic development or led him to 'witty inventions' of all kinds, is a procedure which gives us new vistas, and, we think, new satisfactions. And the new doctrine of the Holy Spirit which we desiderate will have to take account of all that Canon RAVEN has said.

In a recent work, *Divine Humanity* (S.P.C.K. ; 5s. net), the Rev. W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, D.D., who is well versed in recent Biblical and Patristic scholarship, both English and Continental, offers a series of eleven Doctrinal Essays on New Testament Problems. About half of the material here presented has already appeared in the form of magazine articles. The title is suggested by the fact that the papers are intended as a contribution to the understanding of the Incarnation, which the author would define in terms of Chalcedon as interpreted through the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria.

While the papers are learned and full of points, they tend—if one may so put it—to lack point. We mean that, speaking generally, they do not succeed in making a well-defined impression on the reader's mind. But they repay patient study, and we would give in sample of them an account of the paper entitled 'Yet Without Sin.' The subject with which it deals is one of deep importance. It is the problem of the sinlessness of Jesus.

The author begins by asking whether a case can be made out to-day for a man being sinless. The question may be considered in three aspects. Is he sinless in his own estimation, in the estimation of others, or in God's estimation?

To claim that one has never done any harm, to be sinless in one's own estimation, may be the claim

of an unenlightened conscience, which sees only a narrow field of duty. But the claim is not to be lightly dismissed as the product of self-love. Saints of the Catholic Church have been known to present themselves before their confessor with a declaration that they have examined themselves and found no sin. (It is not universally true that the nearer the soul is to God the more deeply it feels the sense of sinfulness.) But God has only to put such saints in a place of difficulty, in which their life is no longer sheltered and free from conflict, and they will become conscious that they fall short of being perfect. Sinlessness is not necessarily perfection of character.

When one is called upon, for example, to rule over one's fellow-men, there is a likelihood not only of staining one's soul through immersion in the world's affairs, but even of causing serious hurt to others through inexperience and lack of judgment. Newman lived for years at the Oratory with less on his conscience than before, but would this state of things have lasted if he had gone to Westminster instead of Manning?

Again, to be sinless in the estimation of others is possible, but may it not be involved once more with a certain narrowness of outlook? In Mrs. Skrine's novel, 'Shepherd Easton's Daughter,' an attempt is made to depict a perfect character. Evil has no power over Dorcas' unspotted purity. But Dorcas' attack on the citadel of evil is unsuccessful. The problems involved are more than the beautiful soul of the solitary mystic can grapple with. Is, then, mere personal sanctity enough? One may possess that but fall far short of perfection of character.

Yet again, when we think of any one's relation to God, our judgment is theological. In comparison with Him who alone is holy and good, every man is a sinner and falls short of God's highest will for him. But in a sense we may believe him sinless. He is 'justified'; that is, God judges him by the direction of his life, not by his present attainment.

We may think, Dr. LOWTHER CLARKE says, of the sinlessness of Jesus in the same three ways. (1) Probably, despite Jn 8⁴⁶ ('which of you convicteth me of sin?'), Jesus would not have estimated Himself as sinless. He was normally unself-conscious in a way we can hardly conceive. Two thoughts dominated His mind, not the Father and the Son, but the Father and the sheep without a shepherd. Real self-consciousness meant for Him not the sense of sinlessness, but conscious union with the Father.

(2) In the estimation of others Jesus is not always regarded as sinless. As a prophet and reformer He became a cause of division, which is reflected in the contemporary judgments concerning Him. And this original divergence of opinion has continued to our day. Jewish writers, who consider Jesus one of the greatest of their race, compare Him unfavourably with Hillel as regards moral excellence. Christians see Him as perfect and, of course, sinless. Is not this just what we should expect? The last thing God Incarnate was likely to be was a colourless good man whom every one agreed to praise.

(3) What the human character of Jesus seemed in the eyes of the Father is a mystery. It is part of the Christian faith that Jesus' character was perfect. Isolated words or acts of His, if recorded of others or found in a different setting, might be judged differently. When they belong to the Jesus Christ of the Church's experience, declared Lord of all by the Resurrection, they form part of a whole which is characterized by perfection.

For the rest, the word 'sinlessness,' which is generally used of the Virgin Mary and may in a sense apply to lesser saints, is not suitable for the description of Jesus' character. If used at all, it should mean, as Grensted says, 'the full and positive response of His whole being to the God whom He knew as Father, and therewith to the guiding of that Power which He taught men to know as the Holy Spirit.'

The Idea of 'Growth' in the Teaching of Jesus.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, M.A., B.Sc., GLASGOW.

THE place and importance of the idea of growth in the mind of the Master and in Christian thought might be supposed to be guaranteed by one of the most famous sentences Jesus uttered: 'Consider the lilies, how they grow. I tell you that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.' It has been said that there is nothing in the literature of antiquity to set beside this appreciation of natural beauty; and that is nearly true. The point that seems to be made is the contrast between raiment where the ornament is the result of laborious human toil, and the glory which is reached by growth. The contrast in the result involves, and suggests at once, a contrast between the method, between toilsome manufacture and the silent, continuous way of life. Consider how they grow!

In place alongside of this come naturally the parables of the blade, the ear, the full corn in the ear; of the mustard seed; of the sower and the seed; and of the leaven. It seems beyond doubt that the phenomena of life, and particularly of growth, had attracted the attention of Jesus and become to Him an illustration of the Divine method. To such passages from the Synoptics has to be added the Johannine allegory of the vine and the branches, whether it be taken as a recollection or a constructive development of the mind of the Master.

All these allusions to growth are congenial to what has been, till quite recently, the atmosphere of modern thought, with its interest in evolution, and its belief in progress, and its desire to harmonize natural and spiritual laws. It is therefore a matter of some surprise that a most energetic and drastic attempt has been made to set them in an entirely new light and evacuate them of what has long been accepted as their plain meaning. In the interest of a certain theological movement the question is raised whether the ideals of development and progress so familiar and congenial to the modern mind were really entertained or utilized by Jesus in the delivery of His message.

The Germans would attribute to a mysterious compound noun, the *Zeitgeist*, the fact that ideas have a vogue independent of frontiers. The craving for dictators appears simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic, and the Nordic shouts for a Strong Man are accompanied by a thin piping among

Presbyterians for the revival of the office of Superintendents. There is a curious coincidence in time between the contempt of scientific anthropology in the Nazi mystic cult of race and blood, and the light-hearted enthusiasm with which a left-wing exponent of Form-criticism discards any definite historical reliability in the Gospels, but says that anyhow he meets God in the narratives. And the era of quantum physics also discloses what one might call a 'quantum' theology which fastens on discontinuity as the essence of truth.

One of our new physicist philosophers made the remark once that on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday science believed in waves, on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday in the quantum, that is, blobs or spurts or particles. The quantum theologians are less modest than the quantum physicists, for they claim all the week for discontinuity, and abhor the very idea of gradualness. Transcendence and miracle are the two categories they employ. Of immanence and development they will hear nothing. The attempt is made to define religion, or at least the Christian religion, as a sheer challenge to reason. Everything spiritual is to be regarded as transcendental miracle to which the proper response is not reflection or study, but the simple ejaculation, 'God.' The ordinary religious believer is less rigid; perhaps less consistent. It cannot be denied that a large part of the most intense life of the Church is based on the idea that religion deals with the sudden, the miraculous, the break with the old stream of causation. The typical religious experience is then held to be the conversion of Paul, typical not only of the beginning of the new life but of its whole course; and the one kind of evangelistic preaching which is effective and relevant to every situation and stage is the evangelistic kind. For, as the famous aphorism runs: 'The perseverance of the saints is made up of new beginnings.' Perhaps the main flow of spiritual energy and material resources in the churches comes from people who, for the moment at least, are at this point of view, and it is those characterized by this outlook who are the mainstay of home and foreign mission enterprise. On the other hand, these same people are perfectly willing to make use of the ideas of immanence and development. At a baptism service they will stress as much the parents' duty to train the child in 'the nurture

and admonition of the Lord' as any theory of baptismal regeneration. The idea of the repeated 'new beginnings' of the saints is not felt to preclude a belief in the continual indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The most fervent missionary repels the demand for quick results and statistics of conversions by the retort that the good seed is being sown and that growth is often as slow and secret as it is sure. The broad fact is that ordinary folk cannot accept so exclusive an emphasis on the transcendent aspect of miracle as to break the thread of continuity altogether and leave in personal life and in history only the illusory degree of reality which attaches to a Mickey Mouse film.

A philosopher might add that the idea that revelation occurs in discontinuous and unrelated flashes not only clashes with the notion of life as continuous and makes the life of Jesus, as far as we are aware of it, a train of sparks in the sky rather than a real incarnation, but also, in disintegrating history and revelation, destroys the idea of God altogether. For a series of sparks cannot be a guarantee of the existence, still less of the character, of a continuous source. Atomic bursts of revelation are not a basis for belief in a faithful and eternal God. In fact, if the faithfulness of God is apprehended at all by men, that constitutes the proof that the revelation of it is not in disconnected instants but in the course of time and through the medium of life.

Leaving aside, however, any philosophical argument, and remarking only that if the liberal theology of the late nineteenth century has failed as an interpretation of the facts, what is called for is an advance in thought and not a mere revaluation and reissue of the verbal coinage of earlier 'fundamentalism,' what about the question whether Jesus Himself made use in His teaching of the conception of growth and development?

Take first the saying, 'Consider the lilies.' The argument of Bultmann, a leading Barthian, is that it is reading an entirely modern notion into the passage to find here a contrast between manufacture and growth. The contrast in the saying, it is urged, is not between the methods but between the results; and the one inference is the bald one that the Divine power and ingenuity surpasses man's. The glory of the lilies illustrates the omnipotence of the Creator. There is no thought of the manner of His working, or of the mystery of life, or of the order of Nature. Only people living in an age that is obsessed by the idea of evolution would fix on the casual word 'grow' as a key to the exegesis, and base on it a congenial theological interpretation.

The parable of the blade and the ear seems to present a harder problem to this line of attack. Bultmann, however, finds the key to its interpretation in the little parable of the vine in 1st Clement: 'O ye fools, consider the vine. First it sheds its leaves, then it buds, then it spreads leaves, then it flowers, then come the sour grapes, and after them follows the ripe fruit. Ye see how in a little time the fruit of the tree comes to maturity. Of a truth yet a little while and His will shall suddenly be accomplished, the Holy Scripture itself bearing witness that "He shall quickly come and not tarry," and that the Lord shall suddenly come to His Temple.' The point of this parable is that the maturing of fruit is not 'natural,' to which adjective Bultmann adds the comment, 'at man's disposal'; but is sheer miracle. And the Gospel parable is said to have that same point. This argument covers also the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven. They, too, are meant to call attention not to order, but to miracle. As for the parable of the sower and the seed, it is conveniently left out of account,¹ and the conclusion is offered that no apparent reference to natural growth can be allowed by a true exegesis to stand in the way of the description of the coming of the Kingdom and the work of grace as sudden, miraculous, unrelated to any time-process that can be subjected to human examination, or in which human co-operation is invited.

The triumph of this forceful argument is, however, on more than one ground doubtful. To begin with, the citation from 1st Clement, when studied in its context, does not carry all the weight Bultmann lays on it. The passage follows on one which lays stress on the gentleness and patience of the Creator, as exhibited in the regular order of Nature. It is followed by another which instances the time taken by seed sown to spring again; and this is amplified by a long reference to 'the well-known instance' of the phoenix of Arabia, whose cycle of solitary life, death, and resurrection is invariably completed in precisely five hundred years, 'as is testified by the priests in Heliopolis in Egypt.' It would, therefore, seem that the point of the parable in 1st Clement is the reliable certainty of God's operation in natural process rather than the sudden, or miraculous, aspect. His purpose is to assure doubters that God's plan cannot fail.

¹ Dodd, in *The Parables of the Kingdom*, finds its one point to be that after all chances and mischances there is a harvest.

Nor is it true to say that the Hebrew mind could make no distinction between the sudden, miraculous intervention of God and a natural, albeit divinely appointed, order. The pages of the Old Testament with which Jesus was so familiar amply refute this notion. The very principle at stake is formally stated in the story of Noah. While prophets went on foretelling judgments and apocalyptic writers dreamt of divinely executed catastrophies, the quiet wisdom of a late priestly writer set down there as one of the fundamental principles of religion which he places in the forefront of canonical Scripture the assurance that methods like the Flood are not going to be the manner of the Divine operation. 'While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease.' The act of God is indeed often described as wrought by His stretched-out arm, but Hosea hears God say instead, 'I will be as the dew unto Israel: he shall blossom as the lily, and cast forth his roots as Lebanon,' and again, 'I taught Ephraim to walk.' Isaiah has the parable of the vineyard 'planted with the choicest vine' that proved a disappointment. Deuteronomy speaks of God raising up a prophet like his brethren, which is the prose of Isaiah's phrase, a 'shoot of the stock of Jesse.' The righteous man of Ps 1 is 'like a tree planted by a river.' Jeremiah is called 'to build and to plant.' If examples of the use by the Hebrew mind of the conception of growth are wanted, literary precedents available to Jesus are there in the Old Testament.

Yet even apart from these, where is the difficulty in believing that when Jesus at one time used the illustrations of the lightning flash and the flood, and at another made the seed and the leaven a parable, He did so with as clear a perception as any ordinary man that these different illustrations do suggest different methods of the Divine operation.

The really decisive ground, however, for refusing to excise the notion of growth from the teaching of Jesus is just the fact that He taught. The parable of the sower embodies the truth that in its essence the process of teaching offers an instance of what Henry Drummond called 'natural law in the spiritual world'—the patient labour often wasted, the period of incubation and of growth, the waiting for harvest. The exercise of the teacher's function assumes mental growth in the hearer. It can be urged that a broad distinction might be drawn between Jesus and the Old Testament prophets to the effect that He believed not only in announcement and declaration, but in

teaching. 'He was daily teaching in the temple.' The obvious motive for instruction by parables is that they have the quality of sticking in the mind, provoking thought, and with reflection increasing in luminosity and suggestiveness. It was not necessary that Simon should grasp at once the whole bearing of the story of 'the two debtors.' A word like 'Go and do thou likewise' is to be pondered over. Other sayings, such as the Golden Rule, or the Beatitudes, leave infinite room for the development of new ideas and are a call for originality in action rather than for obedience to any rule. As T. R. Glover says in *The Ancient World*, Jesus 'realises that to achieve what He wants the Teacher must stamp something indelible on the memory. He, like Socrates, used the analogy of sowing, and aimed at planting something in the mind that would root itself and grow; and He trusted to its development.' It has been well pointed out that in this connexion a curious crudeness lies in the motto of the Oxford Groupers—'Absolute purity, absolute honesty, absolute love.' One might as well speak of an 'absolute' appreciation of music. These virtues, where they are genuine, are growing passions opening out to those who exercise them ever new reaches of attainment. As Plato says, 'Virtue has no master, and as a man honours her or despises her, so he shall have more of her or less.' Character does grow.

One other consideration that would incline to acceptance rather than mistrust of any apparent reference to growth in the words of Jesus is the simple fact that growth was part of His own experience. 'That He grew in wisdom and stature' is the remark of Luke. That He grew, not, it may be said, in holiness or perfection, but in moral stature, is the reflection expressed in Hebrews. 'He learned obedience through the things He suffered,' which Marcus Dods expanded thus: 'Although Son . . . He had yet to learn that perfect submission which is only acquired by obeying in painful and terrifying circumstances.' One fuller hint at the formative experiences is given by Luke in the little narrative of the Child's interview with the doctors in the Temple, 'both hearing them and asking them questions.' In turning from the ancient idea that Jesus is there exhibited as an infant prodigy, moderns have sometimes given an interpretation only a little less ill-conceived by suggesting that here is another instance of the confusion which the innocently profound questions of a child can cause to sophisticated adults. The plain sense of the passage is that it shows Jesus already a student of Scripture

facing the problems of interpretation and eagerly seizing the opportunities to learn from experts.

It is difficult, of course, to know when Scripture citations will convince even those who are loudest in professions of reverence for 'the Word.' For example, though Jesus is reported to have said, 'If ye know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father . . . and to have taught a prayer which expressly declares that forgiveness, be it human or divine, is the same kind of thing, 'Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors,' a whole school of theology vociferates that the rock-bottom truth is that 'God is *totaliter aliter*.' It is hardly possible, however, to set aside the narrative of the Temptation in the wilderness as having no direct bearing on this matter, if due emphasis be attached to the long duration of that experience. It did not require forty days and forty nights to say 'No' to three simple suggestions of the devil. The obvious meaning of the poetic narrative is that it sums up long thought upon the difference between dauntless, daring faith, and forcing God's hand, upon the precedence of spiritual things over what would be called to-day the right to a living wage, and upon compromise as a road to success. The answers Jesus gave are not mere retorts to three invitations, they are statements of the guiding principles that will have to be brought to bear on the various temptations life will always bring. During forty days and forty nights of thought and prayer, Jesus was acquiring the profound insight and wisdom that made Him Master of the difficult art of life. The word for this is spiritual growth. Although there is so little material given by any evangelist from which to speak about the early development of Jesus' mind, the only One who could speak with direct knowledge, Jesus Himself, stresses in this narrative of the Temptation the long duration of a period of perturbation and hesitation from which He emerged equipped with every gift of quick penetration and swift decision. The defeat of the devil is another name for moral and spiritual arrival at maturity. It would be altogether likely that One who has so clear a recollection of this experience of His own should give a place to the conception of growth in His teaching about religion.

It is no part of this argument to belittle the emphasis laid upon the transcendental aspect of the Kingdom in Jesus' teaching. That Jesus preached the Kingdom as '*Gabe nicht Aufgabe*,' a gift, not a task, that the doorway into it is not a victory but a surrender, that everything in the

Christian life is of grace, is elementary gospel truth, and the fact that such things can be urged with revivalist fervour not only in popular preaching, but in theological discussion, is proof that they have been overlooked, if not generally, at least by those whom their discovery moves to passionate utterance. All that is here urged is that if everything in the Divine action upon human personality is to be attributed to the Spirit of God, and if human personality involves any thread of real continuity, the Divine operation must also be capable of interpretation in terms of immanence, and the human response in terms of growth. As Schleiermacher says, 'We cannot isolate sanctification or regeneration'; and again, 'conversion cannot be distinguished from the effects of preparatory grace.' To ask if this or that word of Jesus is addressed to disciples or to outsiders is a misconceived question. The attempt to make a cleavage between what happens before or after conversion, introducing a sharp definition of a distinction between regeneration and sanctification, is a sort of spiritual jurisprudence as artificial as the medico-legal treatment of certain problems of pregnancy and inheritance. Jesus preached to the multitudes, and it is absurd to suggest that He spoke as if what He addressed sometimes specially to the disciples was not meant to do good to any one on the fringe who overheard. Who can say what word, seemingly to be classified as an aid to a regenerate man's sanctification, may not, in fact, be the occasion of the first perceptible inclination of the susceptible spirit to Divine renewal. It happens that on this matter a great modern Christian who may be taken to speak for a race of many millions has given a definite personal testimony. Kagawa says that it was that word, 'Consider the lilies, how they grow,' that brought him to Christ.

A survey of the relevant material in the teaching of Jesus might have seemed a sufficient and a more direct way to establish the fact that He used the idea of growth, and so to defend much familiar exposition from the sabotage of enterprising exegetes working under the urge of dogmatic presuppositions. It is enough here to dwell on one or two crucial places.

One is the parable of the leaven, which has received all these various interpretations. The leaven has been taken to be the announcement of the Kingdom, or the teaching regarding its nature; and the gradual but thorough change it effects may be in the individual members, or in the society they form, or in the world. Against the six

possible combinations of these ideas stands another view, that the leaven may mean the members of the Kingdom themselves who, by contact with outsiders gradually permeate and change the social structure.

The variety of these suggestions raises at once a general question. Is it ever the purpose of a parable to be vaguely yet fruitfully suggestive? Is the way in which these readings can be made to shade into one another an argument against insisting on too rigorous a canon of interpretation? Or is there here just a challenge to decide sharply and clearly which reading is correct? It is to be noticed, however, that one point is common ground on every view. The operation of leaven is familiar, gradual, inevitable; mysterious indeed, but entirely reliable, to use the very word Bultmann repudiates, 'at man's disposal, at every woman's disposal every day.' Is not this therefore the real intention of the parable? The one point driven home in every exposition is that the Kingdom has an aspect which is illustrated by the quiet, ordinary, irresistible phenomenon of growth. Any preacher or teacher or hearer or witness may be patient and unafraid. For 'the kingdom of heaven is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened.'

In the parable of 'the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear' also, it seems strangely per-

verse to ignore the careful emphasis upon the slowness and naturalness of what happens. The man who has cast the seed sleeps, and what occurs while he sleeps is not a miracle, however mysterious, but something confidently to be expected: nor is it in any way a sign of God's special intervention; it is part of a stable order of Nature, 'the earth beareth fruit of herself.' If the Kingdom of God is like this, it is because it, too, takes quiet root and finds in men a soil suited to its growth.

The conclusion to be drawn in these parables and in many other places—in the parable of the barren fig-tree spared and nourished—in the study of the experience of the prodigal son—in the allegory of the vine and the branches—in the story of the pound that made ten—in the saying that 'the Kingdom of God is within you'—in the pleading note that sounds in the words, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden . . . learn of me,' is that Jesus observed curiously the fact of growth, and used the idea in His teaching. This conclusion seems to-day to require a defence that relies not on a still more forceful or ingenious exegesis, but on the operation of that human faculty of reason or common sense to which Jesus Himself hopefully appealed when He turned from the dialecticians of His day, and exclaimed to the crowd that had begun to lose interest, 'Hear me, all of you, and understand.'

Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems.

VII. The Early Post-Exilic Community.

BY THE REVEREND PREBENDARY W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., LITT.D., UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

II.

WE have dealt, so far, with the evidence offered in our sources regarding the history of the early post-exilic community; and we have seen that the *data* are in part both ambiguous and contradictory. The reconstruction of the history of the period is, therefore, difficult; and this difficulty is enhanced by the variety of attempts which have been made at reconstruction. For the present we shall leave this part of our subject in order to examine the religious problem which confronts us. The nature

of this second problem will be grasped in the light of the following observations.

It is necessary that we should examine in some detail certain aspects of the teaching of Deutero-Isaiah (Is 40-55), given towards the close of the exilic period. That in the teaching of this prophet the religion of Israel reached its zenith is universally recognized.

We begin by drawing attention to three subjects prominent in the teaching of this prophet, and it is indispensable that they should be illustrated by a certain number of quotations.

The first is *the doctrine of God*; the monotheistic teaching of Deutero-Isaiah is so well known that just one or two of the many passages in which this teaching is contained will suffice; but the need of laying emphasis on this part of his teaching in the present connexion will be seen in a moment. In Is 43¹⁰ it is said: 'Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am Yahweh; and beside me there is no saviour'; again, in 45⁵⁻⁷.¹⁸ it is taught: 'I am Yahweh, and there is none else; beside me there is no God. . . . that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me; I am Yahweh, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness; I give prosperity, and bring calamity;¹ I am Yahweh, that doeth all these things. . . . For thus saith Yahweh that created the heavens—he is God—that formed the earth and made it; he established it, he created it not (for) a waste, he formed it to be inhabited; I am Yahweh; and there is none else.' From this last verse it follows that all the inhabitants of the earth are to acknowledge the One God, and worship Him; so that the prophet contemplates the salvation of all mankind. It is, thus, secondly, his monotheistic doctrine that necessitates his teaching of *universalism*: 'Look unto me, and be saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. By myself have I sworn, righteousness is gone forth from my mouth, my word shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Only in Yahweh, shall one say, have I righteousness and strength; even to him shall men come . . .' (45²²⁻²⁴). But, and this is the third point, the salvation of the Gentiles is to be brought about, under God, by Israel: 'Behold, thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not, and a nation that knew thee not shall run unto thee, because of Yahweh thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel; for he hath glorified thee' (55⁵). Most pointedly, however, is this brought out in the 'Servant Songs' (whether these belong to Deutero-Isaiah or not is immaterial from the present point of view, they echo his teaching); thus, in the first song it is said: 'I, Yahweh, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles' (42⁶);² similarly, in the second song: 'It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be my

servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth' (49⁶); and, once more, in the fourth song: 'And the nations shall be agitated³ because of him; kings shall shut their mouths; for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider' (52¹⁵). Whether by the 'Servant' we understand an individual or the nation symbolized, is again immaterial in the present connexion; the probability is that he was conceived of at one time as the former, at another as the latter; in either case he, or it, is the means of the salvation of the Gentiles, and that is our present concern.

Here we have, then, uttered by the greatest of Israel's teachers, the sublime doctrine of the unity of God, the assurance of His love for all mankind, and the glorious message that Israel was to be the instrument for bringing all nations to the knowledge of Him who was their heavenly Father and Saviour. What was here proclaimed was nothing less than the ideal of Judaism as a world-religion. On the eve of their setting forth on their journey to the land of their fathers the exiles hear the message of the grand destiny reserved for them.

Let us now turn to the religious teachers of the post-exilic period, and see how they were affected by the thoughts and words of this prince of prophets. It is necessary to determine first in which books this teaching is to be found; unfortunately, there is not unanimity on this matter among scholars; so far as the books of Haggai, Zechariah 1-8, Ezra, and Nehemiah are concerned there is agreement; but there are some others in regard to which there are differences of opinion. Many authorities will, however, agree that some passages in Trito-Isaiah (Is 56-66),⁴ and the books of Malachi and Ruth, belong to the period under consideration. Space forbids our giving reasons for assigning these to the period between 516-444 B.C., but it may be claimed that there is a good deal of justification for this view.⁵ In one particular, and that the most important, all these writings reflect the teaching of Deutero-Isaiah: the doctrine of the unity of God is taken for granted; from his time onwards an absolute monotheism never ceased to be the

³ Following Duhm's emendation.

¹ The R.V. rendering: 'I make peace, and create evil,' is not the meaning of the Hebrew.

² Some scholars do not regard this verse as part of the song, which, they hold, is comprised in vv. 1-4.

⁴ The passages in question are: 56¹⁻⁸ (56²-57¹³ uncertain), 58, 59¹⁵⁻²¹ 63⁷-64² 65, 66.

⁵ See Oesterley and Robinson, *A History of Israel*, ii. 104-108, and *An Introduction to the Books of the O.T.*, 84.

cardinal doctrine of Judaism. The teaching of earlier prophets had tended towards this, and the prophetic (in its original form) Book of Deuteronomy came near to it (Dt 6⁴, but, on the other hand, see, e.g., 10¹⁷); a pure monotheism was taught for the first time by Deutero-Isaiah. On this point, therefore, all the post-exilic teachers are at one with him. When we turn, however, to their attitude towards the Gentiles it is very rarely that Deutero-Isaiah's teaching finds expression; Zechariah, it is true, says: 'And many nations shall join themselves to Yahweh in that day, and shall be my people' (2¹¹, and see also 8²⁰⁻²³); in one or two passages in Malachi one may perhaps discern a similar spirit (1^{5, 11, 14}); further, in the sections of Trito-Isaiah belonging to this period there are a few passages of a universalistic character (56⁷ 65¹ 66²³). These are the only utterances in the post-exilic literature of the fifth century B.C. which re-echo Deutero-Isaiah's universalistic ideals;¹ elsewhere it is always an exclusive, nationalistic spirit that finds expression (e.g. Hag 2^{6, 21, 22}, Zec 1^{15, 20, 21} 5^{10, 11}, and throughout Ezr., Neh.). As to the thought of Israel being the instrument of God for the salvation of the Gentiles, there is but one passage, and that is a little uncertain (Is 66¹⁹),² which contemplates such a thing.

It is not to be denied, therefore, that Deutero-Isaiah's ideal of Judaism becoming a world-religion through the instrumentality of the Jewish nation found but little favour among the teachers of the post-exilic community. To their specific teaching, and to their attitude towards the Gentiles, we shall come presently; it will be profitable to show, first, that in spite of official discountenance, the ideals of Deutero-Isaiah lived on among the more enlightened, few though they may have been, of the Jewish people.

It is in writings belonging to the fourth century and later that passages occur which testify to the continued existence of the universalistic outlook of Deutero-Isaiah. Foremost among these is the Book of Jonah. It need hardly be pointed out that the writer of this book represents a small party among the Jewish community of the late Persian period—perhaps even the early part of the Greek period—which dared to withstand the narrow particularism of the dominant leaders; in opposi-

tion to the belief that the Jews, as the elect people of God, were alone the recipients of the marks of divine favour, and that therefore all other nations were outside the pale of God's mercy and love, this writer teaches both that the Gentiles were objects of divine solicitude, and that the Jewish nation was to be the means of bringing them to the knowledge of God. Forced, against his will, the prophet in this beautiful symbolical narrative becomes the nation's missionary to the most hated of the Gentiles; and the book concludes with the words, put into the mouth of the Almighty: 'Should not I have pity on Nineveh, that great city; wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?' This universalistic note is also struck in a number of the later psalms. Perhaps most notable among these is Ps 87, where the city of God is pictorially represented as the birthplace of the Gentiles; the text is somewhat out of order; emended, vv.³⁻⁷ may be thus rendered:

Glorious things are told of thee, O city of God,
Yahweh writeth in the record of the peoples,
'This one was born there';

I reckon Rahab and Babylon among those that know
me,
Behold, (also) the Philistines, and Tyre, and Cush:
'This one was born there.'

To Zion it shall be said, each one was born in her,
The singers and dancers all respond,
'This one was born there.'

In Ps 102¹⁵⁽¹⁶⁾, again, it is said:

So the nations shall fear the name of Yahweh,
And all the kings of the earth thy glory.

In more than a dozen other passages in the Psalms similar universalistic thoughts are expressed; but further quotations are unnecessary. It is abundantly clear that, though repudiated by those in authority, the ideal of Judaism as a world-religion was held by some of the most God-fearing and spiritual among the Jews during the period indicated.³

It is also of great significance that in many passages in the apocalyptic literature a universalistic spirit is in evidence; this literature, belonging to *circa* 200 B.C. onwards, was looked upon with disfavour by the orthodox Jewish authorities. It would, however, take us too far afield to deal with the Apocalyptic books.

³ To this period belongs also the remarkably universalistic passage—Zec 9¹⁻¹⁰.

¹See, e.g., Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (1914), 456.

² The Book of *Ruth* opposes, in all probability, the nationalistic action of Nehemiah and Ezra in the matter of mixed marriages, and should also be mentioned here.

We must now turn to the other side of this question, and take note of the attitude towards non-Jews of the religious leaders during the post-exilic period.

Of Joshua and Zerubbabel there is but little to say; we have the indirect indication that, inasmuch as they are mentioned in conjunction with Haggai in the matter of the rebuilding of the Temple, they welcomed the co-operation of the people of the land; this would point to a friendly feeling towards those who were not of the captivity;¹ these were Jews, it is true; but Joshua and Zerubbabel showed a more tolerant attitude in this than Nehemiah and Ezra, and in so far they were nearer to the spirit of Deutero-Isaiah. What their attitude would have been towards the Gentiles cannot be said; for them the question had not arisen.

There are two passages in the Book of Haggai, prompted by the disorders within the Persian empire, in which the prophet proclaims the near advent of the Messianic era; in these his attitude towards the Gentiles is made clear; the first is 2⁶⁻⁹: 'Thus saith Yahweh Zebaoth, It is but a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desirable things of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory . . .'; in this passage the prophet proclaims the destruction of heaven and earth preparatory to the creation of a new heaven and earth in the Messianic time; the nations, too, are to be destroyed, and their wealth is to be used for the beautifying of the Temple. In the other passage, 2^{21, 22}, the destruction of the nations is more pointedly expressed: 'I will shake the heavens and the earth; and I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the nations; and I will overthrow the chariots, and those that ride in them; and the horses and their riders shall come down, every one by the sword of his brother.' The vindictive feeling here expressed towards the Gentiles is in striking contrast to such words as: 'Look unto me, and be saved, all the ends of the earth.' That Haggai should show such bitterness towards the Gentiles so soon after the time of Deutero-Isaiah proves that the party of narrow nationalism was already in existence among the exiles in Babylonia; indeed, such a passage as Hag 2¹⁰⁻¹⁴ shows that

Haggai belonged to the strict legalistic party among the exiles; that he had lived among them prior to his coming to Palestine may be regarded as certain.

In the case of Zechariah the spirit of Deutero-Isaiah seems to have been not wholly without effect; it is seen at work in two passages in his book; 2¹¹ has been quoted above, the other, 8²⁰⁻²³, is sufficiently striking to merit quotation: 'Thus saith Yahweh Zebaoth, there shall yet come peoples, and the inhabitants of great cities, and the inhabitants of one (city) shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to intreat the favour of Yahweh, and to seek Yahweh of hosts; I will go also. Yea, many peoples and strong nations shall come to seek Yahweh Zebaoth in Jerusalem, and to intreat the favour of Yahweh. Thus saith Yahweh Zebaoth: In those days ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, shall even take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.' This is an important passage as showing that even one who belonged to the orthodox legalistic party was at times impelled by his better nature to look beyond the confines of nationalistic exclusiveness and to recognize that the God of Israel was also the God of all His created beings, and that it was the zenith of Israel's glory to be the means of bringing them to Him. In this as in other directions Zechariah showed himself a greater teacher than Haggai. Nevertheless, upon the whole, and in spite of gleams of better things, Zechariah's attitude towards the Gentiles must be recognized as disappointing. In essence, what Haggai had proclaimed about the destruction of the Gentiles as a necessary preliminary to the advent of the Messianic time, is repeated by Zechariah in the first two of his night-visions (1⁷⁻¹⁷, see especially v. 15; and 18-21 [He 2¹⁻⁴]); in the latter it is said: '. . . these are come to fray them, to cast down the horns of the nations.' The spirit of bitterness is particularly manifested towards the land of the Exile, in spite of the fact that release had been proclaimed to all the exiles; this is seen in the night-vision wherein Wickedness personified is described as taking up her permanent abode in Shinar (*i.e.* Babylonia; cf. Is 11¹¹, Dn 1²), the implication being that the land in which Wickedness resides is doomed to destruction (5⁶⁻¹¹). In the night-vision that follows (6¹⁻⁸) there is a similar implication in v. 8.

To deal with Nehemiah and Ezra is unnecessary; their attitude towards the Samaritans is well known (see, *e.g.*, Neh 2²⁰ and the whole of 13, Ezr 6³¹).

¹ A very different account is given in Ezr 4¹⁻⁶; but of the unhistorical character of this passage there can be no doubt, see Oesterley and Robinson, *op. cit.*, ii. 88 f.

9¹. 2. 11. 14 10¹⁰); and if they felt this antipathy for those who were, after all, largely of the seed of Israel, the more would this be the case for the Gentiles in general. Their spirit of exclusiveness naturally made impossible any thought of their nation becoming the instrument of salvation to the Gentiles.

From what has been said it will be realized how profoundly critical that post-exilic period was, a period during which the tremendous alternative was being determined as to whether or not Judaism was to become a world-religion. Within that post-exilic community forces were at work which were to decide the destiny of the religion which alone at that time partook in any degree of a spiritual character. Alas, that the champions of Deutero-Isaiah's ideals lost the day—or seemed to; they continued, as we have seen, to bear witness through the ages; but the forces of a rigid exclusiveness were too strong. We do not forget that the world owed to Judaism a monotheistic belief and an ethical code far in advance of anything that mankind had known; that may never be forgotten. Yet it cannot be denied that in practice the religion centred in a narrow nationalistic outlook, a glorying in an arid legalistic system, and in a calculated contempt for all who did not bow to the Law.

Nevertheless, the essence of Deutero-Isaiah's ideals was too great, too sublime, to be permanently submerged. We cannot conclude without recalling how his teaching was accepted and developed by One even greater than he. When in the synagogue at Nazareth our Lord quoted the words from Is 61¹⁻², and applied them to Himself. That He accepted their universalistic teaching is seen in what followed; He reminds His hearers of the

Gentile widow woman of Zarephath to whom Elijah was sent; He reminds them of the cleansing of Naaman, a Gentile, by Elisha; and how engrained was the bitterness felt towards those who showed any sympathy for the Gentiles is painfully illustrated by the attempt to kill our Lord then and there, 'they led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might throw him down headlong' (Lk 4¹⁶⁻³⁰). Very significant, too, were our Lord's words to those who sought from Him a sign from heaven: 'There shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of Jonah' (Mt 16¹⁻⁴), the prophet who preached repentance to the Gentiles. We recall also our Lord's sympathy for the Gentile centurion (Mt 8⁸⁻¹³, Lk 7²⁻¹⁰), and His words: 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel'; His healing of the Syro-Phœnician woman's daughter (Mk 7²⁶⁻³⁰); the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10³⁰⁻³⁷); His rebuke to the disciples for desiring vengeance on the Samaritan village which would not receive Him (Lk 9⁵¹⁻⁵⁶); His healing of the Samaritan leper (Lk 17¹⁵⁻¹⁹); His striking words: 'Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven . . .' (Mt 8¹¹). These and many other things show our Lord's recognition of the teaching of Deutero-Isaiah. If not Judaism, then its transfigured form was to be the world-religion; and, even so, it was true: 'Salvation is from the Jews' (Jn 4²²).

There are some other subjects in connexion with the post-exilic community which have not been touched upon, especially the Messianic expectation, on the one hand, and the Law, on the other; but space forbids our dealing with them here.

Literature.

BARTH'S MAGNUM OPUS.

KARL BARTH has projected a great work. Its title is to be 'Church Dogmatics,' not 'Christian Dogmatics,' as at first announced. For he would emphasize his conviction that Dogmatics is not a 'free' science, but is bound to the sphere of the Church. The first volume appeared in 1927, but the second edition was soon called for; and in 1932 the first part of it appeared. And now

it appears in an English translation under the title of the original, *The Doctrine of the Word of God* (T. & T. Clark; 18s. net). It consists of 'Prolegomena to Church Dogmatics,' and contains five hundred and seventy-five pages. The translator is the Rev. G. T. Thomson, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology at the University of Aberdeen.

The publishers are to be sincerely congratulated on their enterprise in undertaking the publication of this work in an English version; nor does it detract

from the sincerity of our congratulations that we are fully cognizant of the honourable traditions of their house in this matter of introducing notable works of foreign theology to the English reader.

The translator is also to be congratulated on the accomplishment of his task. It must have been a difficult and laborious task, calling for great theological ability and discernment and no small measure of resolute patience. One can imagine the dismay of a translator who has to await the second edition of a work he has translated only to discover that the second edition is a larger volume than the first and yet covers only half the ground! Professor Thomson has succeeded in conveying the author's meaning clearly, if he sometimes leaves us conscious that it is a translation we are reading. But it seems to us that in translating from the German it is often well to be fairly literal; in free translation the author's meaning is readily missed or distorted.

We trust that, now the lines of the great work have been laid down in a way that appears to satisfy the author's mind, he will be able to complete it within a reasonable number of years, and that Professor Thomson will place us still further in his debt by issuing translations as the succeeding volumes appear.

The second half-volume, according to the present programme, will contain what is still to be said on the Doctrine of Revelation, as also what is to be said on the Doctrines of Holy Scripture and 'Church Proclamation.' The four remaining volumes will contain expositions of the Doctrines of God, Creation, Reconciliation, and Redemption respectively. Ethics the author believes to be an integral part of Dogmatics, and it will find its place, or rather its places, at the close of each of the four great Doctrines.

The appearance of this notable volume in an English version might call for an account and estimate of Barth's theology, but perhaps we shall better serve our readers' requirements simply by stating what the volume contains.

In the Introduction the task of Dogmatics is considered, Dogmatics being described as the scientific test to which the Christian Church puts herself regarding the language about God which is peculiar to her. The task of Prolegomena to Dogmatics is also here considered; it is to explain the particular path to knowledge pursued by Dogmatics.

After the Introduction the author proceeds to the Prolegomena or the Doctrine of the Word of God. In this first half-volume two main sections of the exposition appear. The first section deals with the Word of God as the Criterion of Dogmatics, and the second with the Triune God as part of the

Doctrine of Revelation. As already indicated, the Doctrine of Revelation is to be further treated in the second half-volume.

Let us give from Barth's own summaries an impression of the contents of the first section. The Word of God is revealed to faith, and the language about God used by the Church is intended to be its proclamation. So far as it is man's word, directed towards man in the form of sermon and sacrament, it becomes the material of Dogmatics. The Word of God also attests itself in Holy Scripture through prophet and apostle, to whom it was originally and once for all uttered. In all its three forms, as revealed, as proclaimed, and as written, the Word of God is the language of God to man. Dogmatics is the critical question as to Dogma, *i.e.* to the Word of God in Church proclamation; or, concretely, as to the agreement of the Church proclamation with the revelation attested in Scripture. Prolegomena to Dogmatics, in the sense of coming to an understanding about the path of knowledge followed by Dogmatics, must therefore consist in expounding the doctrine of the three forms of the Word of God, as revealed, as written, and as proclaimed.

In the second section, accordingly, the Revelation of God is considered as the first part of the Prolegomena, and the consideration of it begins with the Doctrine of the Trinity. In putting this Doctrine at the head of the Dogmatic system, Barth cites the precedents in Peter of Lombardy and Bonaventura. He is convinced that the Christian concept of Revelation already includes in itself the problem of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and that the first step in the analysis of this concept is to give expression to this Doctrine. And it is an impressive exposition of the Doctrine of the Triune God which meets us in these pages. None could gainsay its learning and acumen. Professor Thomson considers it to be the greatest treatise on the Trinity since the Reformation; there is nothing like it, he says, except Martin Luther and John Calvin.

ISRAEL'S WISDOM LITERATURE.

A theistic philosophy always has two primary questions to answer: How did (or does) God make the world, and how does He maintain contact with man. In other words, there are two problems which demand a solution, that of Creation and that of Communion. From these it is inevitable that supplementary questions should arise, provoked by such stubborn facts as the existence and distribution of suffering, and the mortal destiny of man. Since it is in the Wisdom Literature that we have the

only serious attempts made in ancient Israel at philosophic thinking, it is natural that we should look there for a treatment of the problems which arise in the thoughtful mind.

It is with a selection of these questions that the Rev. O. S. Rankin, B.D., D.Litt., deals in *Israel's Wisdom Literature: Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion* (T. & T. Clark; 10s. net). After a chapter of general introduction, in which special stress is laid on the relation between Jewish Wisdom literature and Christian theology, he discusses theories of individual responsibility, reward and retribution, the belief in the future life, and the personality of Wisdom. To several of these topics more than one chapter is given; nearly a hundred pages are assigned to the question of the life after death, discussed from a number of different points of view. The whole is well documented, and there can be no doubt that Dr. Rankin is a master of his subject.

There are, however, points on which it is still possible to differ from him. His able chapter on individualism in religion, in which he shows conclusively that the single person had a place in the religion of Israel long before the age of Jeremiah, fails to appreciate the real point at issue. The view that 'the human unit in religion is the community, not the individual,' does not mean that the only human personality recognized is the 'corporate personality,' but that the individual had a religion and a religious life only through the community. He could—indeed he must—approach his God, but he could do so only as a member of the human group with which that God was especially associated. For him there was no religious activity outside that group, and, if for any reason he had been excluded from it (as, for instance, by leprosy), the first step was to be reinstated. While, then, Dr. Rankin's argument is cogent when addressed to the position as he understands it, it does not really affect the position as usually held.

A whole chapter is devoted to Job 19^{25ff.} and two kindred psalms, and here Dr. Rankin has lost a great opportunity of making an important contribution to the exegesis of one of the pivotal texts in the Old Testament. Like so many others, he has failed to appreciate the true import of the word rendered 'stand' in v. 25. It does not mean merely 'stand,' but 'stand up,' and assumes a previous sitting or lying position. There are possibilities here which have never been adequately explored, and all that Dr. Rankin has been able to do is to weigh and pass judgment on the theories of his predecessors. A third point which we may particularly

notice arises in his treatment of the conception of Wisdom as a divine 'hypostasis,' and, more specifically, his explanation of the sources of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. Here he suggests very strong Iranian influence, and argues his case with learning and skill. But surely we cannot escape from the fact that every phrase in it is a familiar Philonian expression, saving only the great claim 'the Word became flesh and dwelt among us . . .'? To not a few of his readers the link between this passage and Philo is beyond argument, and if there be external influence, that has been exerted on the Alexandrian philosopher (no impossible hypothesis), not directly on the Evangelist.

One of the notable features of Dr. Rankin's work is his wide scholarship. There is hardly a writer on the subjects with which he deals who is not quoted, and the footnotes are as impressive as the text. Strangely enough, he seems to be more familiar with foreign scholars, particularly with the Germans, than with his own countrymen. No one would have him undervalue the magnificent service that has been done by German scholarship, but it is rather surprising to find that the only reference to Ranstone suggests a misunderstanding of that scholar's position, and that, when Oesterley's theory of Sheol is discussed, it is to the brief sketch in 'Hebrew Religion' that attention is called, and not to the detailed exposition in 'Immortality and the Unseen World.' All these, however, are minor weaknesses, and must not blind us to the fact that Dr. Rankin has produced a book of fine scholarship and acute reasoning, which cannot fail to prove an important contribution to the study of Judaism and of theology in general.

THE UNLIMITED COMMUNITY.

The Unlimited Community, by Mr. Julius W. Friend and Mr. James Feibleman (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net), is, as the sub-title reveals, 'a study of the possibility of social science.' The title is not too revealing to the plain man, nor is the sub-title too encouraging to the sociologist. The book will be regarded in this part of the world as lacking the essentials of humour; nevertheless, it is very much alive intellectually, and its authors are earnest in their desire to see a worthier and happier human society established in time. They hold out no hope of the consummation being reached, even approximately, for a very long time, but the word *unlimited* in the title includes time as well as persons and things, and so the book is sufficiently synoptic.

The thesis may be gathered up thus. The phil-

osophy of Nominalism, which has prevailed since the close of the Middle Ages, has rendered a true sociology impossible. For it holds universals to be figments of the mind, whereas they are real existents independent of the mind, though they are known by the mind and illustrated in the actual world. Nominalism must therefore be discarded and replaced by a true ontology. The ontological principle is 'the logical order,' which is real and changeless, the background of our intramundane existence. It is neither the order of history nor the order of knowledge, but rather something which must be progressively discovered by man, for it is the unseen final cause of all that is actual. The gradual discovery of the logical order will not only bring to light the reality of the Unlimited Community; it will reveal the fact that only in such a community can the logical order be actualized. The Unlimited Community is the organization of the totality of existence, and the logical order finds its true actualization in it. The 'perspective predicament' which is an essential mark of our human situation will doubtless prevent the consummation from being complete, but 'chance' will be eliminated and there will be an approximation to a world that is worth while.

The desideratum for even beginning to reach this consummation is that sociology should be put upon a genuinely scientific, even mathematical, foundation. It is reason that is to work the cure of our social ills. The authors do not profess to supply the actual prescription. Indeed, they are modest enough to write: 'So far we are able to offer only the formula, $v = bg$, where v is the total amount of value of any organization, b the beauty or perfection of that organization, and g the goodness or scope of that organization.' Some readers at least will understand why it was stated earlier in this review that the book under consideration lacked the essentials of humour.

In a word, one half of this book is excellent, while the other half more than borders on the grotesque. Its criticism of Nominalism is scholarly and acute and is eminently worth reading. But when it comes to construction, well, all one can say is that those who are interested in this kind of construction must just be allowed to go on with it. The difficulty with some of us is to understand how any high intelligence can prefer mathematical cobwebs to Revelation. It can only be because Revelation is misunderstood. In any case, if the Unlimited Community is to have its life guided by mathematical formulæ we prefer not to be there.

Christian Faith and Economic Change, by Professor Halford E. Luccock, D.D. (Abingdon Press; \$2.00), is a book written with force and vividness. It deals almost exclusively with the social and economic situation as it presents itself in the United States, and for this reason may lose something of its appeal to English readers. Not only, however, is the situation as depicted one of great interest and importance, but at the same time Professor Luccock shows in his references a wide acquaintance with the condition of things in Europe. While calling for radical change, he does not commit himself, or seek to commit the Church, to any definite political programme. His main thesis is that the inspiration for social salvation and its guiding lines will be found in terms of Christ's doctrines of God, man, sin, and eternal life. Throughout the whole book the writing is vigorous and pointed, the argument is illustrated by relevant incidents and quotations, and the interest of the reader is sustained at a high level from first to last.

A profoundly moving and appealing book has been published which deals with one of the most tragic events of our day: *The Refugees from Germany, April 1933 to December 1935*, by Mr. Norman Bentwich, Director of the High Commission for Refugees from Germany, with a foreword by Viscount Cecil of Chelwood (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). It contains an account of the work which has been done for the refugees during the last two years by many philanthropic organizations in different countries, and by the High Commission which was set up by the League of Nations Assembly in 1933. More than two-thirds of those who left Germany have been settled, mainly in Palestine, but also in America. Many have been absorbed into the cultural life of the old world. Many young men and women have been re-trained for manual occupations. No attempt has been made by Mr. Bentwich to deal with the political aspects of the matter, but this omission has been made good by Viscount Cecil, whose scathing words about the Nazi régime will not seem too strong to those who are acquainted with the savage and brutal persecution that has driven from home and work and livelihood thousands of the most industrious and loyal of Germany's people. The mere statement of the facts, however, is a sufficiently terrible indictment of the German Government, while it also reveals in an impressive way the generosity and kindness that have done so much for the victims of this latest pogrom.

Creative Sex, by Mrs. E. D. Hutchinson, with an

Introduction by Canon Raven (Allen & Unwin ; 3s. 6d. net), is a rather remarkable book on a subject that can easily be mishandled (and often is) with the best intentions. Mrs. Hutchinson has lifted the subject on to a level of thinking and feeling that supplies the right context in which it should be regarded. She neither revels in the subject nor talks nonsense about it, as so many do. Her point is that the creativeness of sex (in its provision of life, in its gift of beauty and joy, in the constant stream of new energy that it sends throughout the higher regions of our civilization) is the factor which should determine our attitude to all its problems. But the author does not always remain on this lofty plane. She has a good deal of shrewd advice to give to married and unmarried alike on practical points, and her book is well calculated to afford the guidance and inspiration which are so much needed on this vexed subject.

Saint Paul : The Man and the Teacher (Cambridge University Press ; 5s. net) is a popular exposition from the pen of Professor C. A. Anderson Scott of a subject which is old but ever new. The work is divided into three parts. First there is an account of the life of St. Paul, in which salient and significant events are noted, misunderstandings guarded against, and illustrations gathered from the Epistles. Then follows an account of the teaching of St. Paul, beginning with his doctrine of God and ending with his doctrine of 'the beyond.' The last and longest portion of the work consists of selected extracts from St. Paul's writings. These extracts are supplied with appropriate headings, and the text is that of the Revised Version. We commend this book very cordially to students and teachers as a clear and reliable exposition of its subject. It does not attempt to trace the genesis of St. Paul's teachings nor to estimate their value, but it is a very useful book within its limits.

The Rev. Frederic C. Spurr very fitly celebrates his ministerial jubilee by the publication of a volume of sermon outlines entitled *More Sermon Substance* (Epworth Press ; 3s. 6d. net). Already two similar volumes have come from his pen and have been favourably received. The present volume makes a worthy addition. It consists of about fifty sermon outlines, a dozen of which deal with the Christian Year, another dozen with the Parables, while the rest are on general Biblical topics. The most obvious thing about these outlines is that they are unusually interesting and readable. The historical setting is sketched with vividness, while at the same time the

preacher always has his eye on the situation as it is to-day. Perhaps unity of treatment tends to be obscured by fullness and variety of matter, but it may be said with confidence that preachers will find here a wealth of suggestion.

A third edition has recently been published of the Archbishop of Armagh's commentary, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (Gill, Dublin ; 15s. net). The work is substantially the same as in previous editions. Dr. MacRory excuses himself from treating in detail many important critical questions, and, in discussing 1 Co 11²³⁻²⁵, commends Transubstantiation in the naivest possible manner.

Two different elements have gone to the composition of the Rev. Dr. Alexander Stewart's book, *Jeremiah : The Man and his Message* (Henderson, Edinburgh ; 5s. net)—a Fundamentalist hostility to 'higher criticism,' and an evangelical impulse to develop the message of the greatest of the prophets. On the first point it will suffice to remark that Dr. Stewart's position is probably due to a widespread confusion between authorship and inspiration. The 'higher critic' believes that, in the communication of Scripture, God inspired a much larger number of persons than earlier generations supposed. If Dr. Stewart finds it necessary to limit the inspiring power of the Holy Spirit to the men whose names stand at the head of our Biblical books, no 'higher critic' would wish him to change his views.

The other element in the book consists of a number of meditations on texts taken from Jeremiah. Their merits lie in the wide range of illustration, the apt quotation from other literature (Browning is a particular favourite), a sincere conviction of the value of Jeremiah's message, and a fervent evangelistic zeal. On the other side of the account we must place a considerable discursiveness, a tendency to exceed the bounds of legitimate exegesis (we sometimes feel that the text would have been better taken from St. Paul), and a repeated failure to penetrate the veil of translation which 'half reveals and half conceals' the Divine message through the prophet. But Dr. Stewart has done his best, and preachers who lack time, inclination, or equipment to study the Scriptures for themselves, might find a number of very good sermons ready-made.

The Christ of Experience, by Beatrice Ferguson (Longmans ; 6s. net), is a book which is a little hard to classify. It is written with great sincerity by one obviously trying to attain a kind of belief through

experience. It is difficult to see how the result differs from the sort of creed most people take more or less for granted. The book is in three parts, entitled 'The Higher Self,' 'The Jesus of History and the Higher Self,' and 'The Universal Meaning of the Higher Self,' but it is not easy to detect any clear line of progress throughout. It is not a book for the theologian, nor yet would it grip the plain man without some speculative training. There is a little philosophy, a little theology, a little mysticism, and a little criticism. Though confessedly an unconventional inquiry, it treads with remarkable assurance the uncertain paths of Biblical criticism. 'The Gospel of St. Mark is the most priceless treasure of literature, for it is the description of Jesus by His friend, and a friend no other than the plain-spoken and practical Peter' (p. 86). On this supposed proved fact other things follow. 'Q' has no terrors or perplexities. And yet the author's conclusions are nothing if not orthodox. If, in the terms of the passage quoted from Eddington as a preface, the intention of the book is to state truth in terms of experience and not as a creed, all we can say is that this book is the account of how an inquiring and earnest soul arrived at a *credo*. As such it has its value, whether or no there be anything remarkable in the experience or startlingly new in its results.

In the Bishop Paddock Lectures, 1936, the Rev. Leonard Hodgson, D.D., D.C.L., Canon of Winchester, inquires whether modern developments in scientific and philosophical thought throw light on the theological idea of grace. The lectures are entitled *The Grace of God in Faith and Philosophy* (Longmans; 6s. net). The inquiry leads Canon Hodgson into unexpected places, and enables us to learn his opinions on the standpoints of some recent writers on theological and philosophical subjects such as Brunner, Nygren, and the Archbishop of York. But he never forgets, nor lets his readers forget, the central purpose of his book. Indeed, the discussion might have been compressed into fewer words; and the frequent references to and citations from his own earlier works tends to be wearisome.

What is the theological problem of grace? It is the problem of preserving the ethical and spiritual nature of Christianity while avoiding Pelagianism. In the Catholic tradition the doctrine of merit was counterbalanced by an *ex opere operato* sacramentalism. In Protestantism an *ex opere operato* conception of faith was counterbalanced by the doctrine of justification by faith alone. And Canon Hodgson

holds that in the light of modern knowledge there is no necessary contradiction between Christianity as a religion of moral effort and as a religion of grace. Faith and philosophy are at one in teaching that both poles of this paradox should be maintained in tension. The suggestion is that the Protestant doctrine of justification should be balanced by Catholic *ex opere operato* sacramentalism. The irenical trend of this suggestion is fittingly found in one who is officially connected with the World Conference on Faith and Order.

The Rev. S. Pearce Carey, M.A., the well-known biographer of William Carey, has written another little life of his great-grandfather. It is entitled simply *Carey* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 1s. net), and is more of the nature of an appreciation than a biography. It has neither chapters nor headings, which seems a pity, though there is a serviceable index. As one would expect after all these years it contains nothing of importance that is new, but it should whet the appetite of those who have not read Carey's life to seek fuller knowledge of that great missionary and servant of Christ. Near the close there is a reference to Dr. Duff which might be somewhat misleading. Dr. Duff's missionary zeal is said to have been 'kindled by Charles Simeon.' To be accurate, Duff's parents' minister was influenced by a visit from Simeon ten years before Duff was born. So the kindling was at third hand. Mr. Pearce Carey has given us a very readable little book.

God's Last Word to Man, by the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, D.D. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), contains sixteen short studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The title is perhaps at first sight somewhat infelicitous, suggesting as it does that God has ceased to speak to man. But, of course, Dr. Morgan's theme is the finality of Christ as it is set forth in this great Epistle. It is a theme after Dr. Morgan's own heart, and he treats it with all his wonted force and fervour. We note that he considers the appearance of Melchizedek to Abraham as a Christophany, an interpretation which seems unnecessarily mystical. On the other hand, he rightly interprets the 'cloud of witnesses' in chapter twelve as witnesses to the Faith, and not, as is often imagined, spectators of our race and warfare. The argument of the Epistle in its broad outline is here set down with clearness and persuasive force.

One night, after the usual service in the chapel of the Boys' Club of St. Giles Cathedral, Edinburgh,

a paper was handed to each boy on which he was asked to write any question concerning the Christian Faith which perplexed him. None of the boys was over eighteen. The result was startling, so startling that the club leader sought the aid of distinguished men in answering the questions. The result is contained in one of the most remarkable books we have come across for a long time—*Asking Them Questions: Problems in Religious Faith and Life* (Milford; 3s. 6d. net). The questions are remarkable, and the men who answered them are a positively dazzling company. Here is a book with brief statements on great problems by the Bishop of London, Dr. N. P. Williams, Dr. A. J. Rawlinson, Dr. Adam C. Welch, Dr. H. R. L. Sheppard, Professor A. E. Taylor, Edwyn Bevan, Professor John Baillie, Professor James Moffatt, Dr. Grensted, Dr. C. H. Dodd, the Rev. George F. Macleod, Father D'Arcy, the Rev. Pat McCormick, Professor W. R. Sorley, Dr. Percy Dearmer, Dr. Clement C. J. Webb, Professor Bowman, Dr. Carnegie Simpson, and Professor Hugh R. Mackintosh. Was there ever a galaxy of writers like this brought together within the covers of a book? And the questions are just as extraordinary. How can God be everywhere at the same time? Why does God permit earthquakes? Can you prove that Jesus lived? Do you need to believe in the Virgin Birth to be a Christian? What is the soul? There are several lessons to be gathered from this book. But the most notable thing about it is that here are found most of the questions that people are asking, and answers to them by most of the thinkers of our time.

Much interest is sure to be taken in Professor Martin Dibelius's new work, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (Nicholson & Watson; 5s. net). This volume is one of the first to be included in a new series which the publishers describe as 'The International Library of Christian Knowledge,' which is being edited by Dr. William Adams Brown and Dr. Bertram Lee Woolf. The hundred pages devoted to the study of the Gospels from the standpoint of Form-Criticism are of entrancing interest, but, unfortunately, Dr. Dibelius adds little to what may be read in his 'From Tradition to Gospel,' beyond a valuable section on 'The Remains of the Apocryphal Gospels,' and he completely ignores criticisms which have been brought against his earlier discussions. He also contents himself with merely stating opinions on many points which in this country at least are still regarded as matters for debate. A pleasing feature of the book is its comprehensive-

ness, and this, no doubt, accounts in part for the want of more minute discussions. Sections are included which discuss the Apocalypses and the Epistles. Here, among many interesting opinions, it is enough to record that Dr. Dibelius refuses to separate 2 Co 10-13 from 2 Co 1-9, thinks that the theory of an Ephesian imprisonment is 'not altogether impossible,' and rejects the Pauline authorship of Ephesians. Much the most important aspect of the treatment is the way in which the New Testament writings are set against the background of early Christian Literature as a whole. In pursuance of this aim discussion is given to the Epistles of Ignatius, to the Letter of Polycarp, and to treatises like 1 Clement and Barnabas. The earliest hortatory Christian Literature is also described, including the 'Household Lists,' the 'Teaching of the Two Ways,' the 'Shepherd' of Hermas, and—although the company is strange—the Epistle of James. Christian prayers, hymns, and histories of the Apostles also receive attention, and even the recently discovered 'Fragments of an Unknown Gospel' are discussed in an Addendum. The fare provided is varied, lavish, and rich.

Dr. John Oman, until recently Principal of Westminster College, Cambridge, was wont to finish his week's labours with informal lectures to his students on preaching. These he has now published under the title of *Concerning the Ministry* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). 'They were just talks, with freedom to wander into by-paths, and were the last effort of the week, when teacher and taught had had more than enough of serious lecturing.' The circumstances of their delivery suggest comparison with Spurgeon's 'Lectures to my Students,' which were also given on Fridays in colloquial style. Needless to say, Dr. Oman cannot aspire to Spurgeon's inimitable raciness and flashing wit. Indeed, one feels that he has been unduly timid about introducing light and personal touches. He indicates that some of the spoken matter has been 'taken out as beneath the dignity of the reader.' Probably most readers will feel that the book would have been brightened if more of the personal element had been retained. The lectures deal almost exclusively with preaching, its preparation, style, and delivery. Out of the abundance of his experience and the vast stores of his reading, Dr. Oman has many things to say that are wise and weighty, while by his breadth of view he keeps continually before his students that their preaching must be vitally connected with their general culture and spiritual life. It is well that at the close of his ministry so great a master in Israel

should have given this rich bequest to the preachers who come after him.

A good many books have recently appeared which tell the story of the Christian Church. But there is room for a fresh one, issued by the Student Movement Press, and written by Vera E. Walker, *A First Church History* (6s. net). It is intended for readers over twelve years of age, and its vivid and pictorial style, with its method of gathering the narrative round great personalities, should appeal to young readers. A feature of the book is the sympathetic impartiality with which systems of different theological colour are expounded. The writer has made her narrative a pageant of great episodes, and our interest never flags to the end. Along with the book is a fascinating 'Time Chart of

Church History,' designed by M. O. Pelton and illustrated by Doris Pailthorpe, showing the periods, the notable events, the outstanding men and women, and books that have made history, which is almost worth the price of the book.

A book designed to sweep back the tide of scientific assurance, and replace in its pristine security the idea of special creations, is *Evolution: Fact or Fiction?*, by Major E. C. Wren (Thynne; 2s. 6d. net). The author contends that if we believe in evolution we cannot believe in the Incarnation or the Atonement, or indeed in Christianity at all. But we need not be alarmed. Evolution is a dream, and a bad dream. And this he proceeds to demonstrate in this earnest little book.

The Third Commandment.

BY THE REVEREND IVOR J. ROBERTON, M.A., D.D., WHITBY.

To us of 1936 the first commandment suggests that we live in a universe, not in a multiverse. Its thought is in tune with that word of the fourth commandment, 'The Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.' As A. B. Davidson has it, 'He who wrote this sentence was certainly a virtual monotheist.' And those who, say in Africa, believe to-day in a plurality of gods, and those elsewhere whose only god to-day is a plurality of nations, abidingly hostile to each other, can obviously have no sufficiently deep peace of spirit; they still live in a multiverse.

The second commandment reminds us of to-day, that the seen world is dependent on the unseen realm. The material world cannot exist to itself, exists only to those conscious of it, whose thought apprehends it. Factors like perception and thought, farther factors of honour, faith, duty, carry it that the ultimate unity is and must be invisible.

The third commandment comes in here asking, 'What is the name, the character, and quality of this ultimate unseen unity?' Plainly just everything, for the world and for us, depends on the answer to 'What is his name?' (Ex 3¹³). The question of questions is 'What is God like?'

Now the Decalogue is prefaced (Ex 20²—expanded 34⁶⁻⁷) by a notable and in a sense final declaration of the Divine Name revealed in history. He is not the kind of God who says to an enslaved Israel, 'Here are my Ten Commandments. Keep them, and I'll deliver you from Egypt.' He is One who with a mighty hand and outstretched arm delivers unconditionally and unreservedly a worthless crew of slaves He has seen fit to choose and love. He did not set His love upon them because they were great or good (Dt 7, *passim*), but just because it was His nature so to do. This was grace, pure grace. And the Ten Commandments, rails to run on rather than chains to wear, are given to an already redeemed people, to let them know the kind of life for which He has so redeemed them, the quality of life, namely, which reveals His own nature and being.

The negative character of the Decalogue, as against Jesus' two New Testament commandments, may have a smack of imperfection. On the other hand, the Ten Commandments save us from cloudy and pulpy confusion about the much abused word love, driving it home that to love God is to keep His day holy, and that to love your neighbour means that his character is safe on your

tongue. Let the Ten Commandments loose in any morally pagan community, even to-day, and they reveal and call for a new and nobler earth.

The basal idea of our commandment is well put by A. B. Davidson. 'Among the Hebrews . . . a name was never a mere distinguishing sign, it always remained descriptive; it expressed the meaning of the person or thing designated. The name bore the same relation to the significance of the person or thing as a word does to a thought.' How many lights flash round this truth, that name equals character, character revealed and expressed! 'The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it, and is safe.' God's character, that means, is something to worship, to trust, to take refuge in, to be served utterly. 'Hallowed be thy name' is Plank One in Jesus' model prayer; 'Glorify thy name' our Lord's cry out of a sorely troubled soul. To 'proclaim the name' is highest honour: to 'profane the name' is to choose moral death: to 'blaspheme the name' is the eternal infamy. The 'My name is in him' of the Ex 23 Angel has its perfect application to Jesus, just as Jesus' perfect achievement is given in 'I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me.' 'There is none other name.'

The essential thing in this Name of God, which must never be taken in vain, is sheer, positive, radiant goodness, goodness that is gracious and redemptive toward moral unworthiness like Israel's, like ours. Far more readily and deeply than we worship omnipotence or omniscience do we human folk worship this goodness of God, incarnate in Jesus. We recognize it by deepest instinct as something of ultimate reality given, not created or imagined by us; and it sends us to our knees as those able to value it, and equally conscious of our own lack of it. Perhaps such recognition of reality, such power that is our birthright, goes deeper in us than we ourselves are apt to realize. If you were suddenly put to-morrow into a new world, a world where two and two, always or sometimes, made five, you would need some mental adjustment, would need to study the science of probabilities; but you could endure such a world without permanent agony. But were you put suddenly to-morrow into a new world where injustice, treachery, and cruelty were the ideals for life, and constituted the name of what was worshipped, you would, even though a man of mediocre moral quality, resent furiously and finally any such system of life values.

It is here, surely, the deepest application of this third commandment grips to-day. That it forbids

false oaths does not stir very much for most of us. That it forbids profane swearing may only remind us of the biting remark (was it Dale or Dods?) that so long as such swearing was merely wrong it persisted; when it became unfashionable it vanished. It is rather (a) irreverence in worship we need forbidden, the gabbling over the tremendous clauses of the model prayer, a false and shocking familiarity in referring to the Incarnate God, the spirit of those who (never really worshipping) deem it a favour to come to church service, probably late, and lounge and weary in it instead of getting humbled and thrilled and hushed of spirit. We need to remember, 'There is not in the world any human assembly so august as a congregation met to worship God.'

But surely it is (b) a far too current irreverence of life that is flashed in on us most terribly by this commandment to-day.

Think of it first as it concerns the individual. Certainly let starch be abolished, and all solemn Pharisaic posturing banned. It remains that sheer irreverence of life has alarmed wiser folk in all ages. Not entering on Scripture enforcement of this, on Isaiah's hammer blows or Jeremiah's tears, one recalls the emphasis of Greek tragedy on the insolence that brings divine judgment. Shakespeare makes Apemantus say, 'The strain of man's bred out into baboon and monkey,' and where Lincoln's first impression of Whitman was, 'Well, he looks like a man,' another soul has felt moved to pray:

God set our feet low and our forehead high,
And show us how a man was made to walk,

certainly not as Bunyan's man walked, who 'could look no way but downward.' William Watson with his Miltonic music memorably contrasted 'the immortal leaders of mankind,' who wore life proudly and humbly, with others best described by 'man's barren levity of mind,' his 'eye to all majestic meanings blind,' his 'laugh mistimed in tragic presences.' Mr. Gladstone once exhorted us to think of life not as a dirty and mean little job, but as an exceeding high and noble calling.

Yet still we find folk like the Lk 12 man, who mandered on confusing his long dead soul with his stomach. Even among those who profess and call themselves Christian there seems to be a competition to cut the Lord's Day down, in quantity and quality both, instead of magnifying it. And in a day when many of science's most wondrous gifts can easily be so abused as to foster irreverence, what hurts most about much current life is that it is not heartily and bravely wicked, but just (often

unconsciously) so sniggeringly cheap and vulgar and profane.

But against all this, so sharply forbidden by this commandment, we have also to-day much to appeal to. Far the best thing in us is our power to recognize and reverence something higher and better than ourselves. We are rediscovering what depths of reverence are in the child heart, rightly dealt with: the graded Sunday School has wrought a welcome miracle here. There is wide new realization of the value of silence—silence that is full and not empty. And if one has marked an unconscious young fool, watching the funeral of the best man in his town pass close by him, and letting it pass him hat on head, hands in pockets, cigarette in mouth, one has also noted a delightful and rowdy squad of young pagan girls, gathered round a big table, set to read slowly and one verse each the simple story of our Lord's Passion, and awed by it into a noble quietness worthy of any Christian worship. 'Take a great big Bible fact or truth, dump it down in a congregation, and leave it to make its own mark' was the counsel given to an ambitious and inquiring preacher by a wiser fellow-workman.

Matthew Arnold's sadness is well seen in his fancy of God starting man off with a heap of letters in his hand, and the task of finding the word he is meant to make. And Arnold's verdict is that man has not yet made what he should, has not yet found the word God would. But if, perhaps more truly, our fancy be that God calls man, from a heap of letters God sets before him, to pick out and recognize the true name of God, we have much of manifest desire, and something of recorded achievement to encourage us. In the Old Testament world God led Israel on from name to name for Himself, corresponding to grace and more grace in His dealings with them. So Jacob became Israel, and Simon became Peter. Our struggle is not to find another than Jesus, but ever more worthily to learn what doing all in the name of Jesus really means. And to one wise to recognize true hunger to know the Name, encouragement comes to-day from strange and diverse places. Dr. P. J. MacLagan writes: 'Here is a Chinese village all astir. The village gods, seated in chairs, are being carried shoulder high through the fields, to the squealing of pipes and the clash of cymbals. The villagers, headed by the elders, follow in straggling procession. The whole thing is tawdry, unkempt, devoid of dignity. But it is the village thanksgiving for a good harvest; and better, surely, than men gazing over rich corn land with never a thought except of the market value of the crop,

or of the merits of some new manure.' That is palpably a reaching out, not wholly in vain, after the Name. The columns of *Punch* in our Western world may not be deemed the likeliest quarter to hearten third-commandment students, yet it is there we find:

When folk do go in doleful guise
And are of life afraid,
I to the hills will lift mine eyes
From whence doth come mine aid.

And very modern youth, so unceasingly criticised, sends us from both sides of the Atlantic hints of a hunger to take the Name, and that not in vain. When you read:

I have a temple I do not
Visit, a heart I have forgot,
A self that I have never met,
A secret shrine

or:

Within my earthly temple there's a crowd,
There's one of me that's humble, one that's proud.
There's one that's broken-hearted for his sins.
There's one who, unrepentant, sits and grins

one recognizes something of that spirit of youth Jesus loved. And when we read:

The world stands out on either side,
No wider than the heart is wide;
Above the world is stretched the sky,
No higher than the soul is high

one senses a spirit in real fear of leaving the Name that is above every name unhallowed, one recognizes a queer, true, very modern echo of what Wordsworth and Tennyson, Ruskin and George Eliot and Oliver Wendell Holmes have chorused in praise of reverence of spirit, the joy and necessity of it.

'For Christ's sake' was in many places and for long periods the usual way of concluding a public prayer. Does not closer Scripture study suggest that it is the forgiving of our sin with which the thought 'For Christ's sake' is most truly and deeply united; and that our prayers should rather be concluded 'In his name' or 'For the name's sake.' 'Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name' is surely a light of clear guidance here. Everything according with God's name and character is in the Will, and therefore obtainable. What is not in that Name and Will must not be given us, and certainly will not be wangled for us 'for Christ's sake.'

To set over against the terrible danger of taking the Name in vain in worship there is the comfort

of the moving suggestion in the promise, 'I will write on him my new name.' That is just to say we shall be like Him in measure as we welcome His making us so. And when it is added, 'His name shall be on their foreheads,' surely the hint lies near that the wearers will be the only folk who cannot see it there.

Finally, for the individual reference, our worship still needs what is suggested by our Lord's so spontaneous words as He knelt, 'Holy Father.' Ceremony and sacrament can be made to appeal to much in us Jesus does not value highly. Prayers of great beauty may be recited by people not really praying. Brilliant preachers can come so to weary folk whose souls are not wholly dead that such folk hunger increasingly for quiet, unexciting fellowship in real worship. They crave the reality of a great and moving reverence, crave to prove it that He does not leave unvisited or unblessed those who so take that peerless Name. It is such living experience of God and of His grace that teaches a man to 'walk before the Lord in the land of the living.' Whatever such a man's share of rank, riches, or this world's learning, he moves through life in the unconscious dignity of one crowned, crowned with loving-kindnesses and tender mercies.

One last brief word must stress it that the fact of this commandment being addressed to Israel rather than to the individual believer sets one who is alive to the world situation to-day, political and economic, thinking furiously. All that has been said so far can be given, and calls for this wider reference. The whole prophetic contention is

that Israel, so small and weak, is to trust utterly to Him who has revealed Himself uniquely to her, rather than to stay on horses, or trust, say, in the shadow of Egypt. Even to Israel so long ago was it plainly said that the ultimate, infinite, positive reality in life is not material force and resource, is not chance or fate, is not a shadowy vagueness that spells nothing to the practical man. It is One with a Name, a revealed Name, One who is wise of plan, strong in purpose, and incredibly patient. It is One who sees to it that supremacy simply does not necessarily go to the big battalions, but is more likely (to turn to 1936 language) to work things out on Kagawa's lines than on Hitler's or Mussolini's. And if that be the meaning of the third commandment for Israel in her external relations with powers that often threatened her, its meaning for her internal conditions is that the State which, small and unworthy, has found itself the peculiar object of God's wondrous grace, the State which knows His Name, must have something of His very care for the defenceless, the dispossessed, the unfairly treated within her own borders. When close to the legislation about not vexing the foreigner we find a strict and particularly moving care for the poor man and for the humble wage-earner, for one's deaf and one's blind brethren, for the hungry and for the aged (Lv 19), we of 1936 feel a flashlight on and a sharp shame for the much in our British life to-day that is persistently, daringly, flagrantly taking the name of God in vain, for all that means our possessing and enjoying what in the sight of God and in reality belongs to other and needier folk, our brethren.

A Suggestion towards a Closer Study of the Significance of the Imagery of the Temptation.

BY A. GEORGETTE BOWDEN-SMITH, S.P.G. MISSION, NORTH CHINA.

No Christian can read the account of the Temptation of our Lord without feeling the deepest awe and reverence. There only and in the Agony of Gethsemane is vouchsafed a glimpse of the spiritual conflict underlying the majestic, unruffled calm which characterizes every phase of the outward appearance of the Life of lives. There are just a few scattered references to the 'straitening'

till the baptism of suffering and sacrifice should be fulfilled and to the cup of bitterness which must be drained to the very dregs, but even so the Lord is seen with His face set towards Jerusalem; the decision made; no hesitation; no shadow of doubt; calmly unfolding to His Disciples all that lay before Him. It is only through the depths of self-revelation in the Temptation that the arresting allusions

in Hebrews to the 'tempted in all points like ourselves' can be even dimly understood.

Strangely enough, though this is generally acknowledged, there seems great unwillingness to accept it as the trance or vision experience which we most certainly find in the Gospels. A Lenten call to special study of the Temptation 'not merely as an introduction to the record of His Ministry but an interpretation of it' goes on to explain that the Christ 'gave it a vivid and pictorial form that would appeal to the Disciples,' and goes on to deplore that in later days 'the story was often told with a literalism that obscured its meaning.' Another Lenten notice of the great importance of the study of the Temptation says that our Lord 'describes His experiences in symbolical language, partly because the inward operations of the mind could hardly be represented to men of that age except as visible transactions, but more particularly because the story of Adam's temptation is also told symbolically.' These selections were made at random and from chance material, but could be multiplied indefinitely. References to the Temptation as a vision are few in number, and yet even a cursory study of the imagery and the stages marked by its changes seem to show a literal and precise record of visual and auditory externalizations in the process of an agonizing and exhausting mental conflict which is partly missed if read in any other way.

Possibly the unwillingness to see in the Temptation a vision like that of the call of Samuel or Isaiah is rooted in a just estimate of what we are permitted to know of our Lord's spiritual experience. He has been called the 'Prince of Mystics,' but, with the exceptions of the Temptation, the Transfiguration, and the angelic strengthening in Gethsemane, the Gospels give no hint that He ever passed into such states as are familiar to all readers of mystic biography and so aptly described by the Prophet Balaam; 'the man who fell having his eyes "open" or "shut"' according to whether the emphasis is placed on sense perception of external objects or on externalized mental impressions, or by St. Paul as a condition in which the subject is unaware whether his perceptions are bodily or purely mental; 'whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell.'

To all but hardened and practised psychologists, a 'vision' or 'externalization' is always more arresting, both subjectively and objectively than any reasoned argument. It has the immediacy and intangible 'something more' that character-

izes the highest achievements in poetry, art, or music. Whether the 'visions' or 'voices' are 'seen' or 'heard' by ourselves or others, the impression is intense and indelible. In terms of psychological explanation the 'vision' or 'externalization' whether 'seen' or 'heard' or muscularly experienced as in the phenomenon of 'levitation,' the imagery is no more 'spiritual' than that of our dreams, the sole difference being that in sleep with our bodily senses almost entirely quiescent, our mental images can project themselves without suffering that contradictory check of 'here' and 'now' which in waking life rigidly confines our thoughts to the subjective mental field. In my waking hours the image of my dead friend comes to my mind and I almost seem to hear her voice, but in my dreams when 'here' and 'there,' 'then' and 'now,' are obliterated by sleep she stands beside me and takes an objective share in our conversation. There is, however, no reason why these objective mental experiences should be confined to our dream lives. Fortunately few of us pass beyond the safety line with the heroine of Kipling's pathetic story *They*; but most of us have 'heard' outside our doors, voices of loved ones lost or distant, or 'listened' to the sound of familiar footsteps in passages they will never tread again. Death-bed stories tell of vivid externalizations of beloved memories; delirium, great bodily weakness, drugs, or strong emotions may so dull or confuse our bodily senses that our mental impressions confront us objectively so that we see straight before us or to one side, we 'hear' in the right ear or the left, we 'feel' a touch on this arm or that: the mental experience is definitely localized in space. This may happen quite apart from any hypnosis or even strong emotion. Canon Streeter in his *The Buddha and the Christ* gives an excellent illustration. A doctor who had treated a patient by suggestion took the Canon to his room, told the subject to close his eyes for a few seconds, and assured him that on opening them he would see his visitor float out of one window and in at the next. The experiment was perfectly successful, and the Canon could, had he been so minded, have produced a sworn witness to a most remarkable instance of 'levitation'; the man sticking manfully and truthfully to his assertion, 'No! I see'd 'un,' when the doctor suggested that it had been merely a dream. In Mr. Andrews' *What I owe to Christ* there is an account of his 'vision' of some one coming towards him slowly 'clothed in Eucharistic vestments, bearing the sacred vessels in his hand.' He adds some very significant reflections. 'It

was some time before I fully realized that the vision had come from within. It must have risen up from the subconscious level of my mind, . . . and it reached me as though it was entirely from outside. But it is literally true that for many years afterwards the intensity of that spiritual moment of luminous vision helped me to keep fast my hold upon those unseen realities of God and Christ and immortality which are not temporal, but eternal.' The objective 'givenness' and subjective value of the 'vision' experience could hardly be better put.

One of the many amazing things about the Bible is the way it ranks reasoned faith above vision: 'If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known to him in a vision, and will speak to him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so . . . with him will I speak mouth to mouth, apparently, and not in dark speeches,' and although the greater number of the prophets may have realized their mission and call through a vision, their highest teaching is neither drawn from visions nor thrown into any such form. Parable and allegory may of course approach vision form, but the 'voices' that called Samuel and Isaiah and Joan of Arc and George Fox represent a distinct and communicable experience, and it would seem something other than perfect sincerity and truth to communicate a spiritual experience in vision form if in actual fact it had been nothing of the kind. Surely the more one ponders the words of Him who could say 'I am the Truth,' and who told His disciples to let their 'yea' be 'yea' and their 'nay,' 'nay'; the more reverent and reasonable it would seem to take every word He spoke at its absolute literal value and try to see all that that might mean, before venturing to dogmatize on an agonizing spiritual experience being 'given a vivid and pictorial form that would appeal to the disciples,' or to write that the Temptation 'is marked by the same externalizing of purely spiritual experiences which is discernible in the story of the Baptism, and Jesus Himself is known to have used such a fashion of speech, though there are features in the narrative which read as if they had been introduced into it through the literary influence of the Old Testament.' One would like to ask how our Lord 'is known to have used this fashion of speech,' and why 'literary influence of the Old Testament' is necessary in the case of a mind so steeped in it that at twelve years it could astonish the doctors of the Temple university by its understanding and its answers, and in after years could turn the subtlest arguments of both Legalists and Rationalists with its quiet 'Have ye never read?'

Still it must be admitted that the instinctive unwillingness to grant vision experience in the perfect balance and unbroken poise of our Lord's life is justified. Up to the very end, the last cry of triumph and half-breathed final prayer of the Cross, He was, as no other ever has been, the Master of His soul, always in conscious control of every word and act; at no moment of sudden surprise or attack, in no awkward social situation, in no sudden frenzy of popularity, in no fierce outburst of fury is there any hint of anything but peace and calm. We read of the trances of St. Theresa being tested by stabs with large needles, of St. Bernard journeying for a whole day beside an Italian lake, blind not only to its beauty but to its very existence. Not so did the Son of Man move with loving eyes and helpful hands amongst the works and children of the Father.

Yet if the account of the Temptation stands as He told it, there was at least one exception, all the more significant to us who read, and all the more terrible to Him who endured it, in that, step by step as the agony deepened, and the strain on His already exhausted powers increased, He felt His mental control gradually failing, as if the scorching flames of doubt would only be quenched in the swirling flood of defeat.

Some years ago a book entitled *The Realism of Jesus* called to a more literal study of His words in order to reach their deepest meaning. May it be that by applying this method to the imagery of the Temptation we may find fresh light on, what all agree is, a passage fundamental to the interpretation of our Lord's ministry.

Its meaning is certainly far from having been exhausted. One writer has suggested that the three scenes correspond to the consideration of the possibility of working with one of the three great national parties: Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians. There was much interest in the idea, and it would be rash to say it might not be partly correct, but it did not seem to go deep enough and also left untouched the relation of our Lord to the movement started by St. John the Baptist, which would seem to come in if it were mainly a question of adherence to any existing party; nor does there appear to be any special significance in the sequence or symbolism of the imagery. Here again Canon Streeter's *The Buddha and the Christ* may be quoted. Writing of science and religion he says: 'there is far more in the psychic life of the individual than the manifested content of consciousness; the subconscious life can only be studied in so far as it has objectified itself in some external way, e.g. by act,

word, or gesture, and these often only obscurely symbolize the inward thing they express.' It may be claimed that the actual forms of the symbols and their sequence and interrelation are in themselves instinct with significance and suggestion hardly to be found elsewhere.

If it is therefore of the highest importance to determine the time order of the three scenes. Dr. Wade in his *New Testament History* states that the St. Matthew order is probably correct for psychological considerations, which, however, he does not give. It is possible that the omission of the Divine Sonship in the Kingly temptation is taken to indicate the deepest stage of the conflict when the assurance of the Baptismal Voice has weakened or even vanished, and that the firm 'Get thee hence, Satan' stands for final victory. On the other hand, the Matthew order breaks a strict verbal and logical sequence which is very clear and also very 'dream-like,' and gives with the exquisite Matthew close of the angelic ministrations a more vivid picture of hard-won fight. In St. Luke the Tempter starts from the assumption that our Lord is the Son of God, but when his suggestion of turning stones into bread meets with the answer that 'man shall not live by bread alone,' the human note is caught up and the call comes to the Christ as *man* to exercise *man's* highest function as ruler; when the Lord's rebuke followed by the injunction, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve,' leads naturally to the Temple courts at the hour of sacrifice, and in the mysterious imagery and the challenge to trust the promise of Divine protection in the leap from the pinnacle, there seems to lie the sign of the deepest and most subtle of all temptations, which has its roots in those religious intuitions which are the ultimate source of life and stronghold of the soul.

But it is in the transition from clear sense impression to complete trance that the Lucan order would seem to carry entire conviction. As the scene opens we see the Lord exhausted with spiritual doubts and hesitations, physically prostrated by bodily fatigue and abstinence, suddenly awaking to the full force of the pangs of hunger and, with half-dazed and yet sharpened senses, craving food and noting the cake-like form of the round sand-worn desert stones. In that first scene the voice of the Tempter only—if even that—is externalized. In view of the fact that only the voice of the Tempter is mentioned, it is strange that the question of the form in which he appeared should ever have arisen. There are, of course, temptations both of

the flesh and of the mind which are of necessity recognized at once, for what they are, and to most of us none the less attractive and dangerous for that. But there are other forms of temptations to which the greatest saints are exposed in which the whole agony of the conflict lies in the very doubt as to the provenance of the impulse. It is significant that only in the second temptation to yield to power, so clearly not of God, is the suggestion wholly and indignantly rejected as Satanic.

In this scene the sense perceptions are already fluctuating, as when we are just falling asleep or going under an anæsthetic. The 'great mountain' is doubtless that on which the bodily eyes of the Lord rest, but He Himself is either there or here or elsewhere as His thoughts carry Him. He is back on some height where He may often have stood as a boy, watching the white sails on the Western waters and the gleam of the Eastern road speaking of the power and commerce of the peoples named in the Scriptures. Leading south was the highway of the all-conquering Romans, made for the marching and countermarching of their irresistible legions. But in the third scene there is no longer any sense perception, and there is even a touch of the grotesque in the impulse to spring off from the pinnacle, quite unlike the desire, so natural to One who knew toil and privation, to devote His prophetic powers to satisfying the needs of men, or with His Royal gifts of leadership to establish the theocratic Kingdom. Then, in comparing the three answers to our Lord, is it only fancy that in the first two the suggestions of the Tempter are countered by plain contrary assertions? the ringing 'not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord,' and the defiant 'him only shalt thou serve'? whilst in the Temple scene, though the impulse to leap off is strange, even when connected with the oft-repeated demands made later for 'a sign from heaven' it is met by a merely negative answer, which, though it marks the actual and final victory, seems to be won at such cost that it is rather a cry of agony than of triumph; and if we add the exquisite phrase in St. Matthew, 'Angels came and ministered unto him,' the end of the conflict comes with complete exhaustion of will and a consciousness lost in heavenly visions. The details of the symbolism and their sequence rouse the same emotions as the mysterious deepening and calmings of waves of tragic sound in the final passage of the *credo* in Bach's Mass, whilst yet more awful depths and inexpressible terrors are dimly divined.

In the first Temptation the Messiah, as the new

Moses, could have fed and led the multitudes without incurring the opposition of the religious leaders. In the second, the Davidic King could have founded an ideal government from which the law of righteousness and love might have gone out to all nations and the rulers would have been on His side. But what figure typifies the Messiah in the Temple? Is it again too presumptuously fanciful to see that the Messiah as Priest fills in the missing colour? Dr. Wade in his *New Testament History* does not suggest this or go on to connect the symbolism with the Hebrews exposition of the new High Priest 'after the order of Melchizedek,' but he gives the first clue in stating that every morning a priest was stationed on a lofty wing of the Temple waiting to catch the first glimpse of the rising sun and give the signal for the hour of the morning sacrifice. Is it perhaps as that Priestly Announcer of the worship of the new day that our Lord stands on the pinnacle? Is it possible that in this passage we have one answer to the many questions we cannot but ask as to the attitude He took towards the Temple and its ritual? Is it too bold to guess that He felt at least as strongly as Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the greatest of the Psalmists on these matters? It was only when translating the details of the Chinese Imperial sacrifices at the altar of Heaven and recalling a passage in some book, whose title and author were not noted, that the present writer realized the full horror of animal sacrifices and their inevitable result in deadening human susceptibility to pain and suffering, and became convinced that He who so loved the sparrows and the lambs could not have seen any-

thing but superstition and error in the slaughter of birds and beasts in the worship of the Father. May there not be in the Cleansing of the Temple, especially in the Johannine version, more than a hint of our Lord's opinion? His allusions to the Temple and its services, and to the offerings made at its altar, taken in their fullest meaning are very significant. One may turn also to the fearless uncompromising speech of St. Stephen as being surely derived from the Master whose spirit he so abundantly possessed and manifested. The author of Hebrews also, to quote Canon Streeter again, 'comes near to suggesting that the sacrifices of the Jewish Temple were but a coarse and clumsy parody of the Divine meaning, now at last clearly revealed in the mind of Christ.'

Here in this last temptation He stands in the Father's House, for here without question is the Son's sphere of action. He may not feed men's bodies, nor may He rule on earth, but here in the inmost shrine of human life, in religion, called to the Divine task by Prophet and Psalmist, instead of giving the signal for sacrifice, let Him free His people from the blinding, deadening forms of external ritual, for here the impulse is guaranteed by Scripture.

May we reverently trace in this last and most agonizing scene of the Temptation some hint of that final emptying of Himself which precluded His being the 'Founder' of the Church—however truly He must ever be its 'Foundation.' He said that He could raise a temple made without hands in three days, but the destruction of the Temple made with hands He left to others.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

MADAME MARQUET-KRAUSE has given a detailed report of her second season's work at Ai (modern *Et-Tell*), which lies just east of Bethel and was the first city to be taken by the Israelites after the fall of Jericho. She has found that the ancient Bronze city, dating from near the beginning of the third millennium, was entirely destroyed about 2000 B.C. by a huge conflagration, which has left a thick burned layer, reaching in some places to four feet in depth. The palace of this early period is remark-

able as having a double floor. There is first a layer of hardened earth, then a bed of ashes, and over this a second layer of well-beaten earth. The ashes cannot be the result of a fire, as they show a complete absence of potsherds or other débris. They can only be meant as a precaution against dampness, and in this respect such foresight compares well with modern expedients. The structure of this royal Canaanite house shows that it had upper chambers, lighted by windows, the

chambers being the ones known in the Old Testament as *'aliyôth* (עֲלִיּוֹת), and the windows those called *hallônîm* (חַלּוֹנִים). We have thus a proof that such roof-chambers in Palestine, placed high up so as to be cool and secluded, are of very ancient origin; and it must have been such Palestinian or West Semitic palaces which the Hittites (especially in Carchemish) and the Assyrians copied, and to which they gave the West Semitic name *bit-khillâni* ('palace with windows'). Jeremiah has given us a description of one of them. 'Woe unto him that saith, I will build me a large-sized house, with spacious roof-chambers (*'aliyôth*), which is called *hallônî* (i.e. Assyr. *khillâni*), and (will have it) cieled with cedar and painted with vermilion' (Jer 22¹⁴, where קִרְיָ should no doubt be חִירָי). The temple at Ai, dating from the same period as the palace (c. 2700 B.C.), has been discovered to be tripartite, exactly like Solomon's in this respect two thousand years later. The first room was an entrance one where the worshippers gathered and met together; the second was the *hékâl* (הֵיכָל), i.e. the hall or nave, otherwise known as the 'Holy Place'; and the third was the *debîr* or innermost room, which was entered by a narrow door, and in which the priest consulted the divinity. This last corresponds to Solomon's 'Holy of Holies' (the throne-room of Yahweh, incorrectly translated 'oracle' both in A.V. and R.V.). In this arrangement of rooms we have evidence that the threefold division of the Jerusalem Temple goes back to very early times, being common throughout Syria, Babylonia, and neighbouring countries many centuries before the Israelites came on the scene. The excavators discovered within the Temple an altar of incense, numerous goblets and large jars of various types, some Egyptian alabasters, the bones of fowls and cattle, and an ivory handle belonging to a ritual knife.

A later city, with a narrow street running north and south, was built on the ashes of this early one, and lasted only a century or two. From the fact that only potsherds believed to belong to the Iron Age were found in its ruins, Madame Krause regards the date of its commencement as about 1200 B.C. (i.e. the beginning of the Iron Age). According to this view the city was uninhabited for about eight hundred years, and must have been in this deserted condition when the Israelites captured Jericho (c. 1400 B.C.). If this were so, it would follow that chs. 7 and 8 of Joshua, describing the taking of Ai, are merely legendary and not historic, or that the story became confused in the

course of transmission and was meant to apply, as Albright suggests, to the neighbouring city of Bethel. But before we accept such a conclusion, it is worth while inquiring whether the excavators have gone properly through the 'Iron Age' city referred to. There is good evidence that potsherds belonging to the Middle Bronze Age (c. 2000-1600 B.C.) and the Late Bronze Age (c. 1600 downwards) have been freely discovered on the site by previous visitors, and a considerable proportion of these are to be found in the collection of the American School. Dr. Garstang, who made soundings at the mound in 1928, also secured specimens which are now in Liverpool; and Albright has stated (in 1933) that cooking-pot rims which have 'complex and varied profiles' and date from the end of 'Cr Age' (i.e. about 1400 B.C.) were 'very common' on the surface. 'This fact,' he says, 'agrees remarkably well with Garstang's apparent demonstration that the fall of Jericho must be dated 1400 B.C.' (*A.S.O.R.*, xiii. 85). Add to this the fact that the site of Ai is known to be very exposed, with nothing to keep the debris of occupation from being washed away and destroyed; and if we judge from Garstang's experience at Jericho, the burning of the city might almost lead to its disappearance. The same result has been noticed at *Râs el-Kharrûbeh* (Anathoth) and at *Tell el-Fûl* (Gibeah) in the case of potsherds (here belonging to the Iron Age). It seems to the writer that the detailed record of Ai's destruction in the Book of Joshua bears authentic historical marks and cannot be dismissed as pure fiction.

It will be remembered that Samson is said to have slain a thousand men with the 'jawbone of an ass' (Jg 15¹⁵). It has been thought by some critics (T. K. Cheyne and others) that this weapon mentioned in the story has a Babylonian origin, and was really the mystic spear or javelin (i.e. lightning) of the god Marduk, as described in one of the Creation tablets. The myth, it is supposed, containing this description, was probably preserved at the sanctuary of Beth-shemesh (Samson = *Shimshôn* in Heb. = Shemesh), and popular speech easily converted the weapon into the 'jawbone of an ass.' This view must be abandoned, however, now that daggers made from the actual jawbones of the wild horse or ass have been discovered in Moravia (at Vestonice and the Pekarna Cave), being used by the mammoth-hunters there in the Magdalenian epoch, as far back as thirty thousand years ago. These weapons, which appear to have been most effective ones, were sometimes engraved with the heads of wild horses, bison, or antelopes, and had

decorated borders of dotted lines. The jawbone in the Samson legend had thus no connexion with Marduk's spear, but was a type of weapon very prevalent in prehistoric times, when bone was utilized as an alternative to stone. The story in the Book of Judges has no doubt some earlier historical basis, long before the epoch of the Philistines, though the precise nature of this can hardly be discovered, but the mention of the jawbone shows it to be of very ancient origin.

The particular type of pottery produced by the Philistines has been studied lately by W. A. Heurtley. Its dependence on the Mycenæan has always been recognized, but it has now been found to be largely eclectic, *i.e.* it was probably not the pottery of the homeland—wherever it was from which they came—but was made by potters who had been familiar with Levantine Mycenæan, especially the Cypriote and Rhodian varieties, but had not the originals before their eyes (such models had probably passed out of currency in the catastrophe of 1196 B.C.), and were relying on their memories. It is of a composite character, for it borrows from all kinds of Mycenæan, but is wholly dependent on none, and is combined with native elements. Its first appearance dates from not long after the cessation of the Mycenæan imports, for stratigraphic evidence shows that it succeeds the latter, on the coast at least, without appreciable interval. It follows from all this that 'Philistine' pottery is not a type that these Ægeans can have brought with them, nor does it prove where they came from, seeing that it draws on so many varieties. Indeed, it may have arisen quite apart from the Philistines, through some local potter with more individuality than his neighbours, and may thus be explained as a special style arising from the particular æsthetic tendency of the district. The question as to who the Philistines were is still debated. It is known that they came from Caphtor (Dt 2²³, Am 9⁷), but where this was is not yet certain. A large body of scholars prefer to locate it in Cilicia and the frontiers of Cappadocia, rather than in Crete, and it is not improbable that there is some identity between the names Caphtor and Cappadocia. The Philistine dress, too, accords with that found in these regions.

Further important discoveries have been made at Ras Shamra last year. An interesting bronze statuette, covered entirely with gold leaf, has been found, representing the god Baal standing in the act of hurling a thunderbolt. The main thing about it, from the Biblical aspect, is that the helmet (made of stone) has two electrum horns fitted on to it, one at each side. Some time ago, a

small stele of another god was discovered at Ras Shamra, provided with one horn in the front. Such horns symbolize the god's awful power, and provide us with an excellent illustration of many Biblical texts. The horn, for example, is said to be, 'exalted' as representing great authority (Ps 89¹⁷), 'lifted up,' to signify arrogance (Ps 75^{4, 5}), 'cut off,' to indicate destruction (Jer 48²⁶), or 'laid in the dust,' to denote humiliation (Job 16¹⁵ R.V.). The symbolic idea also explains why the prophet Zedekiah made horns of iron for the king of Israel to enable him to 'push back the Syrians' (1 K 22¹¹). Textual and other correspondences are still being found between the Ras Shamra tablets and the Old Testament, though the date of the former is several centuries earlier. When some plague occurred at Ugarit, it was usually ascribed to the 'hand of God,' which had turned against the land. Thus, in one of the texts (*Syria*, xiv. 235), we read, 'The hand of God is here, for the pestilence is very strong.' Compare with this certain Old Testament passages, such as Am 1⁸, 'I will turn mine hand against Ekron.' In another tablet (*Syria*, xv. 306) the words occur, 'The water-spring is the desire of the hart (*aylt*),' a sentence which is practically equivalent to Ps 42¹, 'The hart (*ayl*) panteth for the water-brooks.' Again, we read (*Syria*, xiv. 133), 'He sits, and in his hand is the sceptre of childlessness (*sheköl*) and the sceptre of widowhood (*almôn*),' which may be compared with Is 47⁸, 'I shall not sit as a widow (*almanah*), neither shall I know childlessness (*sheköl*).' In *Syria*, xv. 325, we find two words whose significance is doubtful: One of the gods says to Aleyin-Baal, 'With thee are thy seven *glm* and thy eight *hnr*.' Strange to say, the same figures occur in Mic 5⁵, 'When the Assyrian shall come into our land . . . we shall raise against him seven shepherds and eight principal men.' In this Biblical reference we may perhaps discover the meaning of the words referred to. A whole volume could probably be written on the proper names occurring in the tablets. We have already referred to several which are identical with Old Testament ones (Naamán, Elimelek, Hōbah, 'Azzan, etc.), and we here give a few more of this type:

Abde-elim. Cf. 'Abde-ēl, Jer 36²⁶, 'Abdi-ēl, 1 Ch 15¹⁸.

'n. Cf. 'Anā, Gn 36^{2, 20}, 'Unni, 1 Ch 15¹⁸.

Kshln. Cf. Chislon, Nu 34²¹.

Rn. Cf. Rinnā, 1 Ch 4²⁰.

Shb-ēl. Cf. Shebu-ēl, 1 Ch 23¹⁶ 25⁴.

Srd. Cf. Sered, Gn 46¹⁴.

Qdmn. Cf. 'the Kadmonite or Easterner,'

Gn 15¹⁹, perhaps also Job 18²⁰.

Sdy. Cf. Sodi, Nu 13¹⁰.

Rgm-yshshb. Cf. Regem-melek, Zech 7².

Abdhr (= *Obēd-Hur*, 'destruction of Hur').

Cf. 'Ammi-Hur ('kinsman of Hur'),
2 Sam 13³⁷, where the Kethibh is probably
right, and Pash-Hur (Jer 20¹).

The important excavations undertaken of late by Sir Leonard Woolley (See *Abraham, Recent Discoveries*) and other authorities on Mesopotamia have helped to elucidate some difficult problems regarding the Hebrews. For one thing, the fact that Abraham actually existed and that he dwelt originally at Ur in Mesopotamia can no longer be disputed. According to Woolley, the chances that there should have been tablets at Ur or elsewhere bearing his name, and that any one of them should have been preserved, is only about one in a million. Moreover, in the Old Testament record of Abraham there are allusions and whole descriptions which could not possibly have been either remembered or invented by the later Israelites, but are definitely connected with the Mesopotamian civilization of his day (c. 2000 B.C.). Woolley also regards the identity between the Hebrews and the *Habiru* of the cuneiform texts to be conclusive, not only philologically but historically. It has been found that there was a fairly large element of these 'sojourners' at Ur. An altar base of unhewn stone discovered there, and dated c. 2300 B.C., must have belonged to them (cf. Ex 20²⁶). They included Terah and his family; and their general migration to Haran was due to the social and economic conditions of the city at the time. It follows, as we have endeavoured to show elsewhere, that the entry of the Hebrews into Canaan, about forty years after their exodus from Egypt, corresponds with the

invasion of the *Habiru* described in the Amarna Tablets (c. 1400-1370 B.C.), and was really part of the greater inroad in which Sa-gaz, Sûtû, and other elements from the north-east, along with the *Habiru* from the south, combined together in a united attack (perhaps with the consent of the Pharaoh, in order to stem the powerful Hittite advance southward). The fact that the Hebrews had dwelt at Ur, where the Sumerian civilization existed, and then at Haran among a Hurrian population, explains several of their customs and regulations. Abraham's offering up of a ram, for example, at the last moment, instead of his son, was not according to Palestinian conceptions, but was thoroughly Sumerian. So far as we know, there was no human sacrifice among the Sumerians (the self-immolation in the death-pits in prehistoric tombs was a different thing). There is no hint of any such practice in the innumerable religious texts, but rather the opposite. 'The lamb is the substitute for humanity,' we read in one text, 'he hath given up a lamb for his life.' Abraham, in substituting animal for human sacrifice, was probably acting contrary to the Canaanite superstitions and vindicating the higher beliefs he had learned at Ur. The story of the Flood, too, in the Old Testament, bears marks of being a Hurrian version, for the name Noah (it is 'Uta-napishtim' in the Babylonian legend), which has always been a mystery to scholars, seems to be an abbreviation of Na-ah-molel, the name of the hero in the Hurrian fragment. We know that Abraham lived among the Hurrians at Haran, Rebekah came from there, and Jacob remained there for fourteen years. If the Flood story was current in these regions, as we know it was, it is quite probable that the Hebrew version took on the northern tinge, and this accords with the mention of Ararat, a mountain in the far north, which does not occur in the Babylonian legend.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

Sky-writing.

By THE REVEREND R. HUGHES, UTTOXETER.

'Rejoice that your names are written in heaven.'—

Lk 10⁴⁰ (R.V.).

Nor long ago in London I was watching an aeroplane. There was something strange about its

movements. When I first saw it, it was flying fast from right to left high up in the sky. There was a long trail of black smoke behind it. Then it made a big curve downwards and back again, flying now from left to right. Then one more curve down and back and from right to left. Suddenly there was no more smoke behind it; but there high up in the sky was a big black letter S. The aero-

plane now flew on, and when it had got a little way past the smoke it rose up in the air until it was on a level with the top of the letter S. Then it turned down and started dropping towards the earth, leaving behind it once more a straight long column of smoke—the letter I. On it went once more. This time it rose twice as high as before, turned and dropped down again, now making the letter L. I knew then that it had been doing this sort of thing before I first saw it. But there were some tall buildings which had hid my view. So looking carefully around me to make sure that it was safe, I stepped off the pavement on to the road until I could see round the corner of the high buildings. There I saw three more letters in front of the others. They were already beginning to fade; but I could just make out that they were PER. I had been watching the newest kind of advertising. It was sky-writing.

Then I remembered something that Jesus Christ had said to His disciples. 'Rejoice that your names are written in heaven.' Here, then, was a sort of sky-writing spoken of in the Bible. It is really much more wonderful than that which I saw in London. The friends of Jesus to whom He spoke these words were Jews. They belonged to the same race as Abraham and Moses, David and Isaiah. And they felt it was a great honour to have the same blood in their veins as those great saints of God. They belonged to the Jewish Church, and their names were written on the roll of that Church. But already the leaders of the Jewish Church were turning against Jesus. They said He was a false teacher. They warned the people not to listen to Him nor to follow Him. But when the friends of Jesus refused to give Him up, then they struck their names off their books. They said to them: 'You do not any longer belong to our Church. We cast you out.' When that happened they remembered what Jesus had said: 'Rejoice that your names are written in heaven.'

Most of the people who first believed in and followed Jesus were poor. But a few of them were rich. They belonged to noble families, who owned great houses and much land. They had also what we call a family tree. On the family tree were written the names of their fathers and grandfathers and great-grandfathers for a long way back. Their own names had been written there when they were born. When the father of the family died, the house and the land and all the wealth would pass to his son or sons. And the name on the family tree was the title to show that they were to be his. But when the father saw

that his son had become a Christian he was very angry. He did his best to turn him back again to the worship of the idols. And when the son refused and said he could never deny Jesus Christ, the father took a pen and crossed his name from the family tree, saying, 'You are no longer a son of mine.' That meant that he would be turned out of house and home, and would have to go out into the world a poor man. Then he too would remember the words of Jesus Christ. 'Rejoice that your names are written in heaven.' If he had no longer a home on earth, he had a home in heaven. If his earthly father would no longer own him, he had a Heavenly Father who would love him and care for him, and never forsake him.

Some of the friends of Jesus were citizens of the Roman Empire. In those days a man was every bit as proud to belong to the Roman Empire as we are to belong to the British Empire. Paul, who was one of the greatest servants of Jesus Christ, knew that it was a good thing for him that he was a Roman citizen. More than once it saved him from prison and from being flogged. But soon there came a time when the rulers of Rome would no longer protect the Christians. Though they were good people and kept the laws and never gave any real trouble, they were put in prison. They were flogged. They were burnt to death. They were thrown to the wild beasts in the circus. But before doing all that to them the Romans blotted their names out of their books. They said that they were no longer Roman citizens. That meant that they could not have the protection of the law, and men were allowed to ill-treat them as they liked. Paul saw that time coming; and he said to his friends and the friends of Jesus: 'Your citizenship is in heaven. Cæsar may have your names blotted out of the roll of Roman citizens. But do not let that trouble you. Your names are written in heaven.'

As I watched that aeroplane writing its letters in the sky, I noticed that by the time the last letter was written the first was already beginning to fade. In another minute or two the whole word was gone. There was no trace of it left, only the clear blue sky once more. For the writing was in smoke. But when God writes a man's name in heaven it will remain there for ever. It will last and never fade away. And nobody can alter it. Jesus Christ Himself has said: 'I will not blot his name out of the book of life.' And if Jesus does not blot out your name there is no one else who can do so.

Who, then, are they who have their names

written in heaven? They are all those who love Jesus Christ here on earth, and who try to follow Him all through life.

Getting a Lion.

BY THE REVEREND W. R. CLARKE, B.A.,
GLASGOW.

'Thy servant slew . . . the lion.'—I S 17³⁶.

During the illness in 1928 of His late Majesty, King George V., the Prince of Wales, now known as King Edward VIII., was away in Africa on a hunting holiday. As soon as he heard of the illness of his father, the King, he immediately rushed home. He went at once to his father's bedside, and when his father saw him, he looked up at his son and said with a smile, 'Well, David, did you get that lion?'

You see, boys and girls, the Prince was known to the members of his family as David, though he always signed his name, Edward P., and is now known throughout the world as King Edward.

Now when we think of the question that the King asked his son, are we not reminded of another young man, called David, who also got a lion one day? This young man was a shepherd. One day, while he was watching his father's sheep just outside Bethlehem, a lion came prowling softly up to catch a nice fat sheep that he might kill it and carry it off. But David saw the lion and killed it before it could kill any of the sheep. Don't you think that was very brave of David?

Well, one day this young shepherd, David, became a great King and ruled for many years over Israel. Under his rule, Israel became a mighty nation, prosperous and happy. Not only that, but he led the people of Israel back to God, and Israel became the great moral leader of the nations of the world.

To-day we have on the throne of the British Empire a young man who is known to his family as David, though known to us as Edward, our King. Shall we not sometimes think of him as the young man who one day 'got a lion'? And now that he is our King, we all hope that he will get and slay more lions. I mean those fierce lions that are attacking the lives of his people and the homes of the Empire. 'What are they?' I hear little voices asking.

Well, boys and girls, there is the fierce lion of unemployment. How sad it is to see strong young men idle at the street corners. 'Satan finds some mischief still, for idle hands to do.' The police records are full of accounts of young men and women who fall into mischief because

they have too much time on their hands, and who try to get money in the ways of sin. Yes, we want to see the lion of unemployment killed, for it chases people into sin, and blights the homes and the lives of boys and girls who live there.

Then there is the fierce lion of strong drink. This lion drives men and women to prison and to shame. It eats up the food that the children ought to get. It keeps many a home poor, ill-furnished, and diseased. It stands between many boys and girls and good warm clothes. It often drives a father to wreck his home, and a mother to neglect her children. Will it not be a glad day when we see this savage lion lying dead outside the door of the land?

Another fierce lion is gambling. What a hold its teeth has in the life of our land! Hardly a day passes but we read in the newspapers about some one being sent to prison for stealing an employer's money. What is the reason? Horse-racing, dog-racing, or some other form of gambling. First a little was taken, and used for gambling, and lost. A little more was taken to try to win back what was first lost. This was lost as well, and so the stealing went on. Then came exposure and prison. Then there are the thousands upon thousands who do not steal, but who still gamble, and so lose the faith they ought to have in God. We do not want to cage this lion and control it by laws. We must kill it!

These, boys and girls, are three of the lions that we all want slain; and we look to our King to lead the expedition that will bring that about. Will you join that expedition.

Our late beloved King, George V., gave you boys and girls a message last Christmas Day. Do you hear those words now: 'When the time comes, be ready and proud to give your country the service of your work, your mind, and your heart.' You can only do that truly when you give first your heart to Jesus. Then you will help David, now our King Edward, to get more lions of sin and so crush them that, just as under David of Israel, our Empire may return to God and lead the world morally and spiritually.

The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Soul and Other Souls.

'Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.'—I Jn 3¹.

'We are not only gregarious animals liking to be in sight of our fellows,' says William James, 'but

we have a propensity to get ourselves noticed, and noticed favourably by our kind. . . . If no one turned round when we entered, answered when we spoke, or minded what we did, but if every person we met "cut us dead," and acted as if we were non-existing things, a kind of rage and impotent despair would ere long well up in us, from which the cruellest bodily tortures would be a relief.'

It should be a fruitful line of thought, therefore, to contemplate how dependent our soul is for its very being, yea, for its separateness, its individuality, upon its intercourse with other souls. And by the soul we mean just our personality, our self. 'I' am not different from my soul. I *am* a soul. 'Our soul comes to its life by virtue of the brother souls around it.'

Take the mystery of human speech. What is language but the signs and signals by means of which the thoughts that arise in one soul are passed over into another? To quote again, for all this has been often said, and said well, by others: 'One of the first things we learn is to talk, and to listen to talk. And we have been talking and listening on and off ever since. Think of the number of sentences we have spoken, of the words that have rolled off our tongues since then! A queer retrospect when we come to think of it, and so much in it that is hardly golden. The world is carried on under a babel of utterance.'

What does it mean—all this confused murmur of souls flashing signals to other souls? It means that other souls are absolutely necessary to the life of the soul.

There is another side—the solitariness of the soul. The soul has an inner life which no other soul can invade or violate. A man may tell you about his experiences, and you may understand something of their meaning, because you have had similar experiences. But you do not thereby enter and *feel* them. Your sympathetic sorrow or joy is not the weariness or gladness that he feels. We think of the soul as

A still salt pool, locked in with bars of sand,

Left on the shore; that hears all night

The plunging seas draw backward from the land

Their moon-led waters white.

But it is the other half of the truth that we are reminding ourselves of now. We must stand high up on the beach, beholding not one pool, but millions of pools, laced and linked by millions of tiny rills and channels all over the wet gleaming sands. We want to emphasize this single truth: the true life of the soul consists in love; and love

is the finding of oneself in other souls. And for the purposes of our present theme we may define sin as hatred. And hatred not only leads to murder, but it is murder—murder which includes in the end the death of the hate-filled soul. We read the newspaper of a morning. It is choke-full even to nausea of murder and sudden death. But the poison, the bullet, and the knife are not the weapons that presently concern us. We are looking deeper than the outward physical life. We are considering what Christ meant when He said that the passion of hate is itself murder. He who uses the language of contempt, or, as Christ says, calls his brother *Raca* (fool); he who uses the language of slander—calls his brother *Moré* (scoundrel)—he is a murderer.

But it is not only other souls we murder thus. The common voices of our souls are these: 'I love,' 'I hate,' 'I fear.' How narrow and contracted is the circle of which the word 'I love' is spoken! And can any of us speak the word 'I love' perfectly and without reserve?

The wrongs and cruelties which, wittingly or unwittingly, our lusts and passions have caused us to wreak on the souls of others—these are the things which creep into the spiritual ear of the soul, making a great silence around us, as of death. We shudder at the ugliness of Scrooge's soul, in Dickens's story. But are there not times when each of us, in this inner spiritual sense, is a Scrooge? There we sit, in the narrow room of self, behind its darkened walls, peering out through chinks in the shutters, crying 'I hate,' 'I fear!' Such is the isolating veil of reserve which shame forces us to cast around our souls! Such are the shadows, and mists, and glooms of suspicion and estrangement through which we walk alone amid a crowd! That solitude is the shadow of death falling on our own souls.

That is the way of spiritual murder. Because of the touch of impurity, the taint of evil in the heart, we break or mar whatever we touch in this fair world of ours. We murder the world's beauty for ourselves, we murder the love of friends for us, we murder our own peace, we murder hope, we murder joy. Anger, hate, fear in the heart are the shadows of murder there.

'Hates the man anything he would not kill'? asks Shylock, in the trial scene in Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*, and there is hardly another page in literature where we have so powerful a picture of self-made solitude of soul. It was his own soul that Shylock's hate was killing. The Jewish philosopher Philo says that it was not

merely his brother that Cain slew: it was himself.

Love is the life of the soul. We believe it possible to explain every passion of the human soul as a form of love, or the perversion of love. The hatred of Cain for Abel began in envy. Envy is stillborn love—love strangled in the heart, ere it had blossomed into life. It is love's look of regard towards its brother, stopped short after it had travelled but a little way. Envy has a thousand eyes—and is very short-sighted. Jealousy is the ghost of dead or forgotten love. It is the look of a man towards a brother in whose heart he once had a place. Jealousy, too, 'can never be satisfied with anything short of omniscience.' We would fain 'detect the subtlest fold of the heart' that once sheltered us; and we become obsessed by delusions. Suspicion is poisoned love; cynicism, which interprets all goodness in another's life as hypocrisy, attributes all noble deeds to interested motives. Fear is the absence of all love, the demon which displaces charity. Or take a concrete case—the case of Judas. Can we not trace there, painted on the blackest canvas of all the world's immortal pictures, the growing loneliness of soul that ends in death?

But that is not where our imagination wishes to rest. That is only the obverse side of the picture—the result of the soul's disloyalty to other souls. Is there any way up out of this abyss of spiritual death into the life of love? Yes, even for an abandoned soul there is a way up. The first and greatest step from spiritual death to life is taken when remorse is changed into penitence. Remorse is the soul alone with its black thoughts, and banished even from God. But the eternal wonder of the gospel is that God's love breaks through that dark loneliness in one immortal blaze of sacrifice. What is penitence but love-awakened love. The soul has begun to live again, because it has begun to love. All the world of other souls becomes bathed for it in a new and holy light of compassion. Love is the giving impulse: it is the identification of self with the life of others.

Time was when few seemed fair.
But now, as through the streets I go,
There seems no face so shapeless, so
Forlorn but that there's something there
That like the heavens, doth declare
The glory of the great All-fair;
And so mine own each one I call
And so I dare to love you all.

If ours could be a vision of other souls like that

—if we could go forth into the world seeking to be kind and helpful, forgiving and charitable, open, sincere, transparent, seeking the best, believing the best, hoping the best of all men, how the face of the world would be changed!

When Father Dolling was asked what was the secret of his wonderful power to redeem the 'hopeless cases,' as they were called, who were sent to him from all over England, he answered, 'I live inside them by love. When they have ceased to believe in themselves, I trust them, though I know that they are untrustworthy. It is the only way to make them worthy of trust. When they are in despair and never expect to be better, I hope for them with full confidence and do for them what they cannot do for themselves. When they have lost all self-respect and have destroyed their ability to love, I love them, and am soon rewarded with a responsive love.'

Some of the great thinkers whose minds have been absorbed by the thought of a universe transformed at last into one vast, perfect society of souls, have found no room for a personal God there. Over against that blindness of unbelief, we would place the sublime mysticism of St. John. The very reason for the world's unbelief and doubt of God—the very reason of its questioning cry in face of the great silence of God—is just the loneliness of soul that sin has wrought. But a world of souls transformed into a perfect fellowship of love would be a world so flooded with God's presence that doubt and unbelief would vanish for ever. 'He that loveth his brother abideth in the light.'¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Law and the Gospel.

'God . . . deviseth means, that he that is banished be not an outcast from him.'—2 S 14¹⁴ (R.V.).

There is far too much copybook morality in the world. Jesus says in the gospel that, except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, the gates of the Kingdom of Heaven will not open to receive you. The little known but very striking incident in the history of king David, from which the text is taken, affords a remarkable illustration of the Saviour's meaning. The most strict moral principles are a man's righteousness at the best, and at the worst nothing better than hypocrisy. If we are to get anywhere near God we must pitch our righteousness much higher. We must always be building bridges for our brothers and sisters, paving the highway of

¹ J. A. Robertson, *Concerning the Soul*, 83.

human progress with forgiveness, devising means whereby the banished may return. The Pharisee is always blind to the glory that excelleth, always pleading the highest principles instead of God's purpose of redemption. Now that was exactly David's case in the story before us. He was prepared to do violence to his own fatherhood, to strangle the love of his heart, to hazard the divine destinies of his house and people in vindication of his own stern sense of truth and honour. The young man Absalom had been guilty of a crime which was condemned even by the wild justice of those early times. Three years had elapsed since the lawless prince had fled the kingdom, and day by day the old king was eating his heart out in the deserted palace at Jerusalem. No doubt he played the moral parent till the life at Court became a burden to all his ministers.

Joab is by no means a character worthy of our imitation, but this does not prevent us from recognizing that on this question at least he had a juster estimate of the true issues than his more religious master. He avails himself of the simple custom of the times to bring into the royal presence a woman of Tekoah, one of those old wives whose mother-wit has often helped to the solution of seemingly insoluble problems. She leads the king back to those great fundamental principles of the universe, in the light of which all the greater issues of life must be faced.

That pedagogic morality which, in a later age, Jesus described as the righteousness of the Pharisees, and which keeps the Ten Commandments at its finger-ends as the measure of human conduct, solves no problem either in heaven or in earth. The citizens of London may gaze with complacent pride at my lord judge and my Lord Mayor taking their places on the Bench 'to keep the simple folk by their right, and to punish the wrongdoer,' but at best the Court of Justice is but a half-way house in the establishment of righteousness. The real problem, the moral problem of life, is not to impose the ban, but to remove it.

Said Dr. Samuel J. Barrows, one of the foremost criminologists, 'We speak of Howard, Livingstone, Beccaria, and others as great penologists, who have profoundly influenced modern life; but the principles enunciated and the methods introduced by Jesus seem to me to stamp Him as the greatest penologist of any age. He has needed to wait, however, nearly twenty centuries to find His principles and methods recognized in modern law and penology.'

We cannot long escape from becoming canting hypocrites if the one theme on which we can address our brethren is that sentence in Galatians where St. Paul declares that as a man sows so shall he reap. We may as well go back to the cynical statement of the old preacher, 'as the tree falls so will it lie.' Why, the world is a failure indeed if this petty vindication of righteousness is all that God has to show for the groaning and travailing of the centuries. It mocks that higher righteousness whose demand is nothing less than a new creation.

People imagine that there is no alternative to the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees but the iniquity of the publicans and harlots. Christ declares that there is also the righteousness that exceeds, and that it is this, and this only, that penetrates to the Kingdom of Heaven. If we begin by condemning we thereby declare our inability to save. The ferryman of the Styx does not care whether men are slain in a street brawl or despatched by the hands of the public hangman so long as there are passengers for his boat. There is laughter in hell when virtue declares its sentence of banishment against the transgressor and justifies itself by refusing a place of repentance to the guilty. That is why the Lord puts so high a value upon the quality of forgiveness.

God saves us from the faint-hearted impatience which washes its hands of all complicity with the unthankful and evil, and which trembles to be kind lest it should seem to condone. God give us rather the venturesome spirit of that divine charity which beareth all things and which never ceases to hope. Is there not a grave danger lest those who call themselves the disciples of Jesus should, like David in the matter of Absalom, be tempted to wrap themselves in the mantle of their own righteousness, as they contemplate the problem urgently presented by social disturbance and disquiet to all who desire the progress and uplifting of the world? 'The foundations shall be cast down, and what hath the righteous done?'

There is something highly fascinating to many minds in looking upon the forces of the future as raging revolutionary fires. Men are prepared to nail the old flag to the mast and to go down shouting for the Ten Commandments and for the Established Church. There is something magnificent about it, but it is a blank refusal to face the very problem which the circumstances of the time present.

Did David, as he sat gloomily in his palace refusing to devise means for the outcast to return, remember the old Adullam days 'when every one

that was in distress, and every one that was in debt, and everyone that was discontented, gathered themselves unto him; and he became their captain? How this may have been we do not know, but this we know, that the wise woman of Tekoah was able to show before him with convincing power the sovereign truth that God is above all else the Captain of our salvation. His is no narrow Pharisaic righteousness entrenching itself in the fortress of its own ordinances amidst the jeering laughter of the lords of hell. For God there is no dilemma; there is always the third alternative.

God brings forth the gospel, and His triumph is complete. The Cross is the third alternative. That is why it checkmates the hosts of wickedness. God vindicates righteousness in the very act by which He saves. Nowhere in the whole Bible is the power of the Gospel more trenchantly stated than in the words of the Epistle to the Romans, used to express the purpose of the death of Christ, 'that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.' Here is an exhibition of Divine Righteousness beside which the storm and tempest of celestial wrath shrinks to a puny exercise of power. It is the eternal justice on fire with forgiving mercy.

No ideal character, says Fosdick, can be imagined now without this Christlike quality of forgiveness. When Browning portrays the beautiful character of Pompilia in 'The Ring and the Book,' the picture is not complete until Guido has wronged her cruelly and she, with all her consciousness of bitter injustice done her, is still steadfast in her unconquerable goodwill and readiness to pardon. When Tennyson imagines King Arthur, the perfect knight, the portrayal cannot be consummated until, deeply wronged by Guinevere, his Queen, he stands beside her, as she lies penitent upon the floor of the nunnery.

Think not that I come to urge thy crimes,
I did not come to curse thee, Guinevere,
I, whose vast pity almost makes me die
To see thee, laying there thy golden head,
My pride in happier summers, at my feet.
The wrath which forced my thoughts on that fierce
law,
The doom of treason and the flaming death,
(When first I learnt thee hidden here) is past.

And all is past, the sin is sinn'd, and I,
Lo! I forgive thee, as Eternal God
Forgives.

Let us imitate our Heavenly Father. 'He

maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.' We think we should like to see a clockwork deity dealing out rewards and punishments from day to day, crowning what seems to us good, damning what seems to us evil. But what sort of a being would God appear if He were to make this earth of ours nothing but a scrap-heap of ruined purposes, of derelict lives? God cannot be righteous unless He redeems. God cannot do justly unless He forgives. In His patience He is kind to the unthankful and evil, not because He thinks lightly of human transgression, but because in His own Passion He Himself comes forth to bear our iniquities. In bearing one another's burdens we fulfil the law of Christ. We make the most of men because we dare to think the best of them, for we have found a liberality in the heart of God which establishes truth in forgiving, a kindness in His justice which brings the outcast home.¹

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Pain.

'The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.'—Ro 8²².

'I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed to us-ward.'—Ro 8¹⁸ (R.V.).

1. *The Problem of Pain.*—There can be no question but that we are more sensitive to the presence of pain than our fathers seem to have been. At any rate we pay more attention to its existence, and our sympathies are more readily aroused. Undoubtedly the question suggested itself to most of the finer spirits of antiquity. The principal of the Greek tragedies recognized the deep pathos of human life, and the nobler philosophies both of the Eastern and Western worlds are only to be understood according to the standpoint from which they view the problem of pain. But, as Dr. Martineau said, there is one striking difference between the ancient and the modern world, and that difference consists in the absence from the former of all institutions for the care of the sick, the disabled, and the unfortunate. Hospitals, orphanages, and almshouses are the product of a later civilization. The Book of Job does not state the problem of pain as it presents itself to us. The question for the author of that marvellous work is simply, 'Why do the righteous suffer?' It is not, 'Why should there be suffering at all.'

¹ J. G. Simpson, *Great Ideas of Religion*, 229.

It would be foolish to claim that modern susceptibility to pain is clearly and indisputably due to the influence of Christianity, but we may say without fear of being untrue to the facts that wherever the spirit of Christianity has prevailed such susceptibility has ensued. The spirit of Jesus was one of pity without pessimism, and that same spirit has invariably been exhibited in the noblest of His followers. St. Francis of Assisi, for example, preaching to the little birds and overflowing with sympathy for the brute creation, shows himself capable of understanding that the whole creation 'groaneth and travaileth in pain together.' The history of ecclesiastical Christianity is not to be confounded with that of Christian spiritual experience. The Inquisition, with its horrifying atrocities and its insensibility to pity, exhibited not the spirit of Christ but of Antichrist.

It is the noblest spirits who feel most the pressure of the problem. The present is an age in which philanthropic labours and willing self-sacrifice are well to the fore, and it is just those in whom the sentiment of pity, the desire for self-oblation, and the willing performance of rescue work are most developed who see most clearly the perplexing fact of pain. The sufferings of the sympathetic are part of the total of human woe. As a sorrowing father said after he had been watching by the dying bed of his daughter, 'Had it been in my power to bear her pain for her how gladly would I have done it! I could not bear to see her suffer; how is it that God could?'

2. *The Light from the Cross.*—It is remarkable that we have in the New Testament no indications that Jesus was ever puzzled or confounded by the existence of pain. Yet Jesus is in many ways the cause of modern sensitiveness to the problem. He went about doing good, healing the sick, cleansing the lepers, raising the dead.

Alas for grief! but for those tears,
Which fell at Bethany.

His own susceptibility to sorrow is very marked. Yet it never altered or deflected His message concerning the goodness of the God who is the Author of all.

Two more things might be noted in this connexion. First, that Jesus' susceptibility to the presence of pain, conjoined to the sweetness of His revelation of God, has been the source of a spiritual experience in thousands of our fellow-men, an experience which is of itself a tentative solution of the great world-problem. Every Christian saint has reproduced the dominant notes

of his Master's character—perfect trust in the love of God, willing acceptance of pain, and sympathy with the suffering of others. A Roman Catholic writer has said: 'If we compare either the characters of holy men, or the broader facts of history, before and since the Crucifixion, there are few contrasts so remarkable as the presence or absence of that special quality which may be called the grace and bloom of sacrifice, which is the chivalry of self-devotion, and gives to heroic patience its winning and attractive power. It seems as though, till Christ had lived and died, that fulness of human sympathy was impossible.'

The second thing to be noted here is that our twentieth-century pathological sensitiveness is more directly due to the humanitarian impulse communicated by Jesus Christ than to any other cause whatsoever. Believers and unbelievers alike have been affected by the influence of the inner spirit of Christendom, and learned to pity and to save.

We are confronted with the paradox that some of those who have learned of Christ to realize the depth of human woe have also come to challenge Jesus' God—the God with whom Jesus in purpose, mind, and will identified Himself. Those who appropriate Jesus' pity might learn to appropriate Jesus' principle that pain is good because God is good. Like Him we may pray for the cup to pass, but, like Him also, we should be prepared to say 'Thy will be done!' not because we cannot avoid it, but because it is the absolutely right and the absolutely best. Gethsemane and Calvary have shown us that pain is the source of all that is deepest and truest within ourselves.

Yet another light is shed upon this subject by Jesus' witness, not only that pain is a part of the moral order of the world, but an experience in which God shares with man. 'I am not alone—the Father is with me.' Can this be true? If so, we are getting very near to the heart of things. Is God a sharer in the agony of the world? If we are to believe the testimony of Him who spake as never man spake, such is indeed the case.

That pain is a process leading to joy is a proposition that to the spiritual man needs no defence. We have a feeling that goodness and gladness ought to be united, and so they shall be, if the highest human witness is to be believed. They can only be united, however, through the operation of the seeming paradox that gladness shall be sacrificed to the attainment of goodness, and shall keep no consciousness of itself as its object. The highest happiness is to be found in the willingness

to surrender happiness. The principle of the Cross is the secret of joy—joy that is beaten out on the anvil of pain. Thus apprehended pain is embraced as a good.

Let no one think that more than this is possible on this side of the grave. We have here the earnest of heavenly joy, but it is joy 'touched with pain.' God's way is the way of joy, but it leads beyond the tomb. May it be ours to say with Christina Rossetti:

Content with all day brings and night will bring,
Life wanes; and when love folds his wings above

Tired hope, and less we feel his conscious pulse,

Let us go fall asleep, dear friend, in peace:

A little while, and age and sorrow cease;

A little while, and life reborn annuls

Loss and decay and death, and all is love.¹

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Shallows or the Deep.

'He [Jesus] said unto Simon, Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught. And Simon answering said unto him, Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing: nevertheless at thy word I will let down the net.'—Lk 5⁴⁶.

Nowhere in the Gospels, take them altogether, do we get a complete picture of the earthly life of our Saviour. But what is there recorded is of the most important significance, indicating to us what we might most humbly call the strategy of Jesus in carefully working out a plan for training a small group of humans to begin the great enterprise for which He came to die and rise again.

There are eight stages in the training of the Twelve for their world mission, and every one of them significant. We might think of them as eight steps upward in the development of a vision of the magnitude and value of Christ, and of the need of the world for Christ, that enabled those men fearlessly and intelligently to go out into the world, when Christ had disappeared from the sight of men, to preach His gospel.

The first stage is associated with the meeting with Andrew, and James, and John, and Peter, alluded to in the first chapter of John. The second is this incident. The third is the setting them apart for their apostolic service at the close of the Sermon on the Mount. The fourth is the Great Confession in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew, followed a little later by the Transfiguration, which is the fifth stage. And the sixth

is one of the most illuminating; it is their acceptance of martyrdom. 'Come, let us go and die with him!' The seventh stage is associated with the Last Supper, and the eighth with the Great Commission.

We have alluded to these eight stages to show there is something behind this simple story of Jesus meeting with these young men at the lakeside. Jesus wants to bind them to Him in a little more intimate way, to go a stage farther with their training, so He joins them and finds them disappointed and depressed. He suggested to Simon, 'Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught.' Let us look for a moment at that proposal of Jesus.

1. In the first place, it is the sort of proposal that ought to touch a man's imagination, for there is here a contrast that we find in our own lives. Browning says in one unforgettable verse:

Thank God, a man has two soul sides;
One to face the world with, and the other
To show a woman when he loves her.

There is the nature shown to the world, to our business or our pleasures, and there is another side of our life that is not shown to the world. So there is this contrast in every life between the shallows and the deep, between a frontier of experience limited and measured by a familiar shore-line, and a frontier of anticipation and imagination that is measured only by the horizon of the open sea.

This is a question that every man has to decide eventually, whether he is going to vote most heavily for the shallow side of things, or put all his emphasis on to the deep and mysterious side of things. And that was the 'something' that Jesus was gradually forcing into the lives of these young men.

2. He said, 'Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught.' Now, Peter's answer to that was the answer of a man who knew a great deal more about fishing than Jesus did. He said, with his accustomed bluntness: 'Master, this is not the time to fish. We have toiled all night, and we have taken nothing.' Peter's experience had taught him that the morning hour was no time to go fishing, because the glare of the sunlight was so great on the sea it would scare away the fish from the nets.

Many of us feel the same thing when the preacher says things to us concerning spiritual adventures or experiences. The man in the pew will say, 'Well, what does the preacher know about the sharp stresses and strains of business life? We

¹ R. J. Campbell, *A Faith for To-day*, 138.

know it through experience. He knows life only theoretically.' The only infallible thing, or what we *call* infallible, to any individual is experience. And yet it may lead us wrong. What we wish to emphasize here is that our experience is erroneously something that attaches us to a measurably familiar shore. Jesus was trying to get these men to turn deliberately round and look out towards something inexperienced, beyond their experience and imagination and their dreams. He is always trying to do that.

3. Here we come upon a third thing. Peter said: 'Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing; nevertheless at thy word I will let down the net.' That is the difference between an irreligious and a religious attitude towards life. In the one case, the man will not move an *inch* beyond experience, and he says the final reaches of experience are common sense.

Chesterton says, 'That the Christian virtues do not begin to be virtues until they appear to be unreasonable.' And was there ever anything more unreasonable than this pale-faced, dreaming young Jew, saying to those older experienced fishermen: 'Launch out into the deep,' when all along the shore were fishermen mending their nets, ready to laugh at them if they did it.

Yet Peter said, 'Lord, if you say so, we will do it.' That is the religious attitude towards life. When a great change in life is to begin it draws us, oftentimes, against the testimony of experience. Call it common sense, worldly wisdom, philosophy, science—whatever any of them have to say on this subject, we have got to act contrary to them.

The deeps of life. That was what Jesus was impressing on these young men. And Peter and his colleagues went out and let down the net, and they got a great cargo of fish. But they got something infinitely more than fish.

'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' What was that? It was the birth of reverence in that man's soul for a flame of life and authority that he had never imagined was in Jesus before. The idea conveyed the sort of thing that needs to come to this generation more than anything, just to get the right sense of the magnitude and value and significance of Jesus Christ in our own lives. Our modern church life, as a rule, has been gradually and appallingly deprived of the sense of awfulness in life by the smallness of this too human Jesus that we have been hearing about for a whole generation in our churches. Now, before this occasion our Lord was called Messiah,

but that term was a phrase which had not gripped the soul or the imagination of these men. But from that time on it was something more, something mysterious, something beyond human definition. And Peter's soul responded to it with a new sense of reverence and awe that put him on his knees.

And this new discovery by Peter led him to the discovery of amazing capacities and possibilities in these young men. We all know how a man's business or profession may narrow him. There is an old saying: 'Born a man, died a grocer.' But what Peter learned was that there was something in himself too big to be shut up in fishing problems; not that he was going to give up business, or turn his back on the tradition of his fathers, but that there was something else which came first. Until a man discovers that there is something bigger in the world than the business he is doing, he has not found the thing Jesus wants him to find. That is the trouble with so many of our Church people. Their religion is not so important as their business.

When Jesus invited Peter to give up and adventure himself beyond the ranges of his so-called experience, He asked this man to put business behind loyalty to Him and not in front: and so He said: 'Follow me, and I will enable you to catch men alive.' That is the Bible phrase; not 'to be fishers of men.'

Catch men! What a thought that is! Will they do it? Those young fellows won't do it with influence and office and worldly position. But we have seen people give themselves whole-heartedly to God, as if nothing could make the cause of Christ prevail without it. And if we have that kind of faith, why, it simply lifts us above all our discouragements, out of the dominion of our commonplace limits of experience, and sets our faces towards the billows of the living sea.¹

At the conclusion of the Civil War General Armstrong devoted himself to what seemed to many to be the almost hopeless task of raising the standard of negro life in the United States. Yet his task became his triumph. For this man, having built upon a rock, believed that there is nothing too difficult for God. At Lake Mohawk, at a public meeting, a member of the audience objected to a course proposed by him as being impossible. The General was on his feet in an instant. 'And what,' he blazed, 'are Christians put into the world for but to do the impossible in the strength of God?'

¹ H. E. Kirk, *The Glory of Common Things*, 23.

At the Feast of Booths.

A SUGGESTED REARRANGEMENT OF JOHN vii.-ix.

By THE REVEREND C. CLARE OKE, M.A., SUNDRIDGE, ONTARIO.

'THE fact that the entire public ministry [of the Johannine Christ] is presented in the form of scenes at five great religious feasts . . . shows how artistically the Evangelist arranges his material. For on each occasion he describes a single mighty work of Jesus symbolical of the religious significance of the feast in question; and this is accompanied by a discourse approximating in form the Platonic dialogue, a form which had become classic for religious and philosophic teaching.' No couple of sentences were ever more illuminating with regard to the structure of the Gospel of John than these by the late B. W. Bacon (*Jesus and Paul*, 219). But in this section (chs. 7-9) the symbolic miracle is described in ch. 9 far from the specification of the festival at 7², and the address that seems plainly connected with it (8¹²⁻²⁰) is left hanging in the air in ch. 8. Instead of furnishing an exception, however, to the rule to which Bacon drew attention, this division of the Gospel, I submit, should have the present order of its contents corrected in the light of that rule.

An arrangement of the material in these chapters has been suggested by Professor G. H. C. Macgregor in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, November 1921, and in his commentary on the Gospel of John in the Moffatt series. The arrangement that he offers is as follows: 4, 6, 5, 7¹⁵⁻²⁴, 8¹²⁻²⁰, 7¹⁻¹⁴, 7²⁵⁻³⁶, 8²¹⁻⁵⁹, 7⁴⁵⁻⁵², 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴, 9. With much of that arrangement one can agree, in particular with the grouping of 7²⁵⁻³⁶, 8²¹⁻⁵⁹, 7⁴⁵⁻⁵². But with Dr. Macgregor's connecting of 8¹²⁻²⁰ with 5, 7¹⁵⁻²⁴, and his leaving of 9 in isolation from 7²⁻¹⁴, the present writer cannot, mainly because of the pattern detected by Bacon and referred to above, agree. The order of the passages which I am proposing is: 5, 7¹⁵⁻²⁴, 7¹⁻¹⁴ (καὶ ἐδίδασκεν should probably be omitted in v. 14 as an editorial preparation for 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ which was inserted at this point), 9, 10¹⁹⁻²¹, 8¹²⁻²⁰, 7²⁵⁻³⁶, 8²¹⁻⁵⁹, 7⁴⁵⁻⁵², 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴.

That 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ is out of place in ch. 7 and belongs to ch. 5 is generally admitted by modern scholars.

The passage 7¹⁻¹⁴ is most naturally introduced after 5, 7¹⁵⁻²⁴. 'Verse 19 shows an apprehension of the hostile intention of the rulers, which explains Jesus' reluctance to go up to the next feast (verses 7, 8); and the angry retort of the crowd (ver. 20)

shows that they were not aware of the rulers' intentions, as they afterwards became (ver. 13)' (Garvie, *The Abingdon Bible Commentary*, 1075b).

Ch. 9 should, I am suggesting, follow 7¹⁻¹⁴. My main reason is that it is the Evangelist's regular procedure, as Bacon saw, to mention a feast, to follow that up by a miracle or 'sign' having a bearing upon some feature of that feast, and then to ascribe an address or proclamation to Jesus also having a relation to that same feature. This method of procedure makes it very unlikely that the author would narrate the healing of the blind man, surely symbolic of part of the religious significance of the Feast of Booths, as if it happened after it; and that he would record the almost certainly related announcement of Christ as the Light of the world as also after the feast and as unconnected with the symbolic miracle. At this feast, in addition to the construction of booths or arbours, there were two other important features. One was the lighting every night of four great chandeliers in the Court of the Women, which was thought of as a memorial of the pillar of fire in the days of pilgrimage. The other important ceremony was that of water-drawing. Every morning, including probably the eighth, a priest followed by a procession went down to the pool of Siloam—another contact of the healing of the blind man (9⁷) with the Feast of Booths—and drew water from it in a golden pitcher. The water was then carried back to the Temple and poured into one of the funnels of the altar. This was explained as a commemoration of the gift of water in the wilderness. In view of the feast ritual of lighting up the Temple, we might expect from the author's custom elsewhere a pictorial presentation of Jesus supplying light to men—the healing of a blind man would be his inevitable choice from among the traditions of Jesus' miracles (cf. 20³⁰)—shortly after the mention of the feast, and also a declaration that Christ is the Light of the world in intimate connexion with that parabolic miracle. In other words, the writer's usual arrangement of his material leads us to expect ch. 9 and 8¹²⁻²⁰ after 7¹⁻¹⁴.

Ch. 9 can follow 7¹⁻¹⁴. It is out of place after ch. 8, as Macgregor points out: 'Jesus would not thus (by healing a man) attract attention to Himself

immediately after His escape (in 8⁵⁹). The only other available passage that might follow 7¹⁴ is 7²⁵⁻²⁶ (so Moffatt, Macgregor). At first sight this paragraph appears to fit in that position, but a closer examination will show that it fits far better after 8²⁰. Now it appears to me that καὶ ἐδίδασκεν may have been added to effect a juncture between 7¹⁻¹⁴ and 7¹⁵⁻²⁴, which had become displaced from 5 and had to be located somewhere. Even with the retention of καὶ ἐδίδασκεν, ch. 9 fits in quite well, for ἐδίδασκεν, 'He was engaged in teaching,' does not, of course, rule out occasional cessation from speaking nor preclude moving about and so observing the afflicted man. But with the omission of καὶ ἐδίδασκεν, ch. 9 follows perfectly: 'But when the festival was now at its centre Jesus went up into the Temple. And as He was passing along He saw a man blind from birth.' This reconstruction is corroborated by the fact that the Temple or its entrance was the usual resort of invalids and beggars (cf. Ac 3²).

The short paragraph 10¹⁹⁻²¹ is taken by most recent scholars with ch. 9 (so, e.g., Burton, Moffatt, Macgregor, Garvie). So taken, it rounds off that chapter, which otherwise closes rather abruptly, describing, as the Evangelist elsewhere takes pains to do (cf. 6^{66ff.}, 7^{43, 44}), the impression made by Jesus upon His hearers. It forms, further, an admirable introduction to 8¹²⁻²⁰ (so Burton and others), which with its opening 'therefore' requires that others than Jesus should be last speaking.

The passage 8¹²⁻²⁰ goes with 9, 10¹⁹⁻²¹. Macgregor admits that this arrangement is appropriate enough, but he claims that 'the thought of the verses is so closely akin to that of chapter 5 and 7¹⁵⁻²⁴, and provides so appropriate a climax to the whole section, that one can hardly resist the conclusion that 8¹²⁻²⁰ was originally part of this same discourse.' But weightier reasons, I think, can be adduced for connecting the paragraph with ch. 9, the most important of which is the author's habit of having a speech or declaration at each festival bearing upon the festival in question and upon the act performed at it, in this case the Feast of Booths with its ritual of illumination and the giving of light to the man born blind. And if there are echoes of 5, 7¹⁵⁻²⁴, there are also echoes of ch. 9, some of which are clear enough to be decisive: 8¹², 'Jesus therefore spoke to them again'—the 'again' should be particularly noted—'saying, "I am the light of the world,"' repeats 9⁵, 'When I am in the world, I am the light of the world'; 8¹³, with its mention of the Pharisees, refers back to 9^{13, 15, 16, 40}, whereas there is no allusion at all

to the Pharisees in 5, 7¹⁵⁻²⁴; 8¹⁴, with its 'you do not know where I come from,' echoes 9²⁹, 'as for this fellow, we do not know where he is from'; and 8¹⁶, with its reference to judging, repeats 9³⁹. Finally, the treasury (v.²⁰) was the most appropriate place possible for the proclamation of Christ as the Light of the world, for it was the Court of the Women where the treasury was located (so, e.g., Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* ii. 165), that was lit up during the festival. It was in the face of its physical light that Jesus was represented as pointing to Himself as the Source of spiritual light.

The paragraph 7²⁵⁻²⁶ seems on first sight to go quite well after 7¹⁴ (so Moffatt, Macgregor), but on closer scrutiny it is seen to go much better after 8²⁰. It is true that the remarks of the Jerusalemites in 7^{25b-26} could follow the mere appearance of Jesus in the Temple (7¹⁴), but they follow better a situation described by the Evangelist of teaching and freedom from molestation or arrest (8²⁰). Moreover, and very important, if 7¹⁻¹⁴ is followed without a break by 7²⁵⁻²⁶, then the reference to 'signs' in 7³¹ is unprepared for: only one miracle had been performed in Jerusalem, and that at the previous feast. If, however, the passage follows 9, 10¹⁹⁻²¹, 8¹²⁻²⁰, the people had had 'signs' done before them (the plural implies at least two), and one of these, the healing of the blind man, was that which had occasioned the question (cf. and n.b. 9¹⁸): the question would hardly come 'out of the blue' at the memory of one cure several weeks before. Further, 'He who sent me' in v.²⁸ refers back, not to anything discoverable in 7¹⁻¹⁴, but to 8^{16, 18}, and 'Whom you do not know' in the same verse to 8^{19b}. Again, it should be noticed that the ἐλάλησεν of 8²⁰ is echoed in the author's framing of the comments of the crowd, in the λαλεῖ of 7²⁶; if 7¹⁴ in its present form had originally preceded, we should probably have had διδάσκει.

The passage 8²¹⁻⁵⁹ obviously resumes 7²⁵⁻²⁶, and does not call for comment.

On the placing and transposition of 7⁴⁵⁻⁵² and 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴, Macgregor should be quoted: 'As the text stands, at 7³² the officers are sent to arrest Jesus, but it is not till a new day has dawned at 7³⁷ that they report to their masters at 7⁴⁵. With the suggested re-arrangement, at 7³² the officers are despatched, at 8⁵⁹ they allow Jesus to escape, and in the very next verse, 7⁴⁵, they are called to account for their remissness; moreover, these events can now be assigned to a single day. We are then left with 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴ as an impressive climax to the whole section dealing with Jesus' visit to the Feast

of Booths' (*op. cit.*, 205). According to Edersheim (*op. cit.* ii. 160), the ceremony of water-drawing took place every day of the feast, including the last, with which 7³⁷⁻⁴⁴ has to do. It is over against that rite that Jesus is made to present Himself as the Source of living water.

One of the two papyrus leaves of an Unknown Gospel recently found and published appears curiously to confirm the re-arrangement of these passages that I have suggested. The saying, 'Search the Scriptures in which ye think that ye have life: these are they which testify of me,' is parallel to Jn 5³⁹. The next sentence, 'Think not that I am come to accuse you to my Father; there is one that accuseth you, Moses, in whom you have set your hope,' is parallel to Jn 5⁴⁵. The rejoinder of the rulers, 'We know well that God spoke to Moses; but as for thee, we know not whence thou art,' is parallel to Jn 9²⁹, but Jesus is addressed instead of being referred to as in John. The first statement on the other side of the leaf, in all probability the next page, 'And they could not take him, for the hour of the betrayal had not yet come,' is parallel to Jn 8^{20b} or 7³⁰. And the concluding sentence, 'But the Lord going forth himself through the midst of them, conveyed himself away from them,' is parallel to Jn 8⁵⁹, *8^{ca}ACL* (cf. 5¹³, Lk 4⁴⁰). Now it seems to me quite improbable that John was using this Gospel or a common source. If John had had the words 'the hour of the betrayal' before him, he would never have shortened and obscured them by writing simply 'His hour.' It is far more likely that the author of the fragment was using John. The phrase 'the hour of the betrayal' looks quite plainly like an *interpretation* of a Johannine expression.

But if the author of the fragment was writing with John before him or in his mind, then the order in which he quotes John *may* be an indication of the original order underlying these chapters. At any rate, it should be observed that he quotes John in the order 5^{39, 45}, 9²⁹, 8²⁰ (or 7³⁰), 8⁵⁹, which is exactly in accord with the re-arrangement of the material of these chapters that I have proposed.

P.S.—As Mr. Oke's article was written in the light of Professor G. H. C. Macgregor's work, the latter has kindly sent the following note:

'Mr. Oke's re-arrangement appears to me to be as convincing as such a purely conjectural reconstruction ever can be, and this is a problem where bold conjecture is certainly necessary. The suggestion to insert ch. 9 plus ch. 10¹⁹⁻²¹ in the middle of ch. 7 is, so far as I know, original, and the resultant sequence is most attractive. It makes it possible, with Burton, to place 8¹²⁻²⁰ after 10¹⁹⁻²¹ and yet retain it (and also 8²¹⁻⁵⁹) within the context of ch. 7, as in my own re-arrangement. Mr. Oke's argument that 8¹²⁻²⁰ contains numerous echoes of ch. 9 and must therefore follow it, and his defence of the transition from 8²⁰ to 7²⁵ (also, I think, an original suggestion), both seem to me convincing. The evidence of the "Unknown Gospel" is at least a suggestive coincidence. I find that Mr. Oke's arrangement does not pass so well as my own the mathematical test of space-measurement—the assumption being that each separate dislocated passage should be a multiple of a fixed page-unit (say about 9.5 lines of the W.H. small Greek text), and therefore capable of falling out of place through the accidental disarrangement of loose leaves. But one becomes increasingly sceptical of such "proofs"!—EDITOR.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The German Church Controversy.

THIS pamphlet¹ is of much greater interest and importance than its size suggests; for it very frankly and fully conveys the motives and intentions of one of the most influential men in the Church controversy in Germany. I have in articles

¹ *Von der Neuordnung der Kirche, Drei Reden von D. Wilhelm Zöllner, Vorsitzender des Reichskirchen-ausschusses* (Weltdeutscher Lutherverlag, Witten, 1936).

which I have written described the situation since the change of policy as one of promise or peril, conciliation or conflict, and have tried, contrary to the opinion of some newspaper correspondents, to recognize that the intentions of the German Government were not to be assumed to be hostile to the Church, although their methods left much to be desired. I have expressed confidence in the author, whom I know and esteem personally, and his speeches justify that confidence. With him the

interests of the gospel and the Church come before all others, and even if he should make mistakes, his desire is to bring peace into the Church that it may be effective in its work as *Volkskirche*, the Church responsible for the religious condition of the nation. He disclaims any purpose to make the Evangelical Church a *Staatskirche*, a State Church, subordinate in its activities to the policy of the Government. If the opposition continues, it is possible that the 'totalitarian' State *more suo* may again resort to repression; but it is well for us to hear both sides in the controversy.

The side of the opposition in the Confessional Church is stated very vigorously by the Pastor of the Church in Dahlem-Berlin,¹ who is the leader of the irreconcilable party. He expresses his suspicion of the honest intentions of Herr Kerl, the Minister to whom the restoration of order and peace in the Church has been entrusted, and his doubt of the ability, even if willing, of the Church Committees, central and local, whom the Minister has appointed to advise him, to secure a satisfactory settlement. He sees in all these proposals only the intention to subjugate the Church completely to the State; hence his title.

In this connexion also may be mentioned a protest signed by thirty-six professors against Dr. Karl Barth's interventions in the controversy headed *Karl Barth's Pretension to be the Pope of the Protestant Church*. Passing over the merely personal references, the antithesis between the Barthian position as these its opponents regard it, and their own may be set out in the words of the protest: 'I. We deny: (1) any theology which proclaims the irreconcilable division of time and Eternity, thereby hindering active Christian piety and ethic; (2) the internal Romanization of Protestantism, likewise the claim of a single ecclesiastical group to set itself up as the sole saving Church within Protestantism; (3) the Calvinization of German Lutheranism; (4) the infallibility of Councils and Synods even when they meet to-day for, according to Luther, Councils and Synods are liable to err.

'II. We maintain—in behalf of Scriptures and Confessions—(1) the Bible is no idol, and Christianity is no book religion, the Spirit is concealed in the letter and becomes living only in spiritual exposition. (2) Our confession is the living Christ, not a dogmatic form. (3) The Reformation is still going on (Schleiermacher). (4) In the entrance of

¹ *Die Staatskirche ist da!*, von Martin Niemöller, Rheinisch Westf. Gemeindegtag (Wuppertal, Barmen).

God into history in the Person of Jesus Christ we perceive the key to Christian theology and piety. We look upon history also as the place where God realized Himself in the flesh, and we believe that this realization of God is also concealed in the dynamic of spiritual and cultural life and in the life of the State.

'III. With regard to theological education we desire (1) the continuation of theological faculties as organic parts of the State universities; (2) "the dangerous freedom of faith" in theological thought rather than a stereotyped theology or "schools" and sects.'

Among the signatories of this protest are so well-known names as Seeberg, Titius, Wobbermin, Winckler, Otto. There are some things so expressed here as would make me hesitate about endorsement, but with the general import I find myself in agreement.

The Church controversy has had as one result that Lutherans and Reformed have fallen back on their distinctive creeds, and thus are tending to separate their organizations where under political pressure there had been ecclesiastical union. This separate organization would, however, not exclude the co-operation of Lutherans and Reformed in the German Evangelical Church. Some of the bishops in the Confessional Synod have already taken steps to form the Lutheran organization of their churches. In the fortnightly magazine *Lutherische Kirche* (15th April), Dr. Hermann Sasse, Professor of Church History at Erlangen, who till recently took a very active part in the Lausanne Faith and Order Movement, writes on 'The Task of the Lutheran Church in Germany To-day,' and his statement may be summarized. The Evangelical Lutheran Church must in future be maintained to proclaim the Word of God, the Law and the Gospel unfalsified, especially 'the article of the justification of the sinner *sola gratia sola fide*,' and 'the highly comforting doctrine of the real presence of the true body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ' in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. There must be a well-ordered Church, in which in accordance with the belief in the universal priesthood, the rights and duties of the congregation are recognized, but the estimate of the ministerial office is maintained. While there should be co-operation of the Church with the Government as such, there must be no interference of the State in the government of the Church, which belongs to the Church alone. The government of the Church as well as the office of preacher must be bound to the con-

fession recognized in the Church. The German Evangelical Church cannot be recognized as a church but only as a federation of churches determined by their own confessions; under such conditions there can be co-operation with the Reformed churches. In facing a common foe there can be no ecclesiastical-political union, but only a genuine relation of churches to one another, and an interchange of theological thought. The disastrous division of Protestantism thus survives.

Lastly, attention may be called to an *Appeal to Christians of all Nations on behalf of the German Evangelical Church* by Dr. Zöllner, already mentioned, in which he seeks to secure a more sympathetic attitude from the non-German churches not only to this Church, which has the support of the State, but even for the National-Socialist State as a bulwark against the flood of Bolshevism, which otherwise would have overwhelmed Europe. Whether the danger was really as great as it is represented, there is no doubt that the support the Christian churches of Germany have given to the new régime is due to a genuine belief in its reality, and Christians in Germany often express their surprise that the debt due to the Third Empire is not more gratefully recognized abroad. Herr Hitler, as the leader of the Christian people, is quoted as describing the common foe in these terms: 'A world of super-sensible representations is laid in ruins, a God is dethroned, religions and churches plucked up by the root, the Hereafter laid waste and a painful Here-and-now proclaimed as alone existing.' The encouragement which for a time the German Government was giving to the paganizing movement makes it difficult for us to represent the Chancellor as the Christian champion; but the plea for a closer co-operation of the Christian churches against the common foe remains valid.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

Varia.

It was during the two centuries that followed the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 that the foundations of Judaism as we know it were laid. The task was carried out by a succession of learned and devoted men, to whom the general name of Tannaim is given. It is to them that we owe the present form of the Mishnah, but the codification and editing of this work was not their only contribution to Jewish literature, and there was, in

particular, a group of four documents which are fundamental for an appreciation of their spirit. These may be regarded as a commentary on the legal portions of the Pentateuch, though some of the narrative portions are included. They begin with the so-called Mekilta, which deals with Exodus, from the twelfth chapter onwards, followed by the Siphra concerned with Leviticus, and the two Siphre on Numbers and Deuteronomy. Unfortunately the only one of the group readily accessible to English readers is the Siphre on Numbers, of which a translation by Levertoff was issued through the S.P.C.K. in 1926. This, however, will serve as an illustration of the general method followed in these works.

It seems that a complete edition of the four books was planned by the late Dr. H. S. Horowitz, but he lived to publish only the Siphre on Numbers. His notes on the Mekilta, however, were nearly complete, and were used as the basis of an edition which appeared in 1931. His studies on the Siphre on Deuteronomy seem to have been less advanced, but much was available for the use of Dr. Finkelstein. In the present edition¹ we have the text, together with full critical apparatus and brief notes. The whole is written in Hebrew, and is of the greatest value to the specialist in Rabbinic studies, though difficult for the average Christian student, and it is to be wished that some steps could be taken to bring it within the reach of the ordinary reader. This is the more desirable, since, while the book resembles the Siphre on Numbers in general, it comes from a different wing of the Rabbinic school. The former work represents the views of R. Ishmael and his school, while the present work springs from the sterner and more conservative party which followed the famous Rabbi Aqiba. In estimating the forces which contributed to the foundation of mediæval and modern Judaism it is necessary to take both into account, and the Siphre on Deuteronomy is thus indispensable for a complete view of the age.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

DR. JOHN L. NUELSEN has published a detailed historical investigation² into the question of Ordination as it concerns the various branches of the Methodist Church in England, Europe, and

¹ *Siphre zu Deuteronomium*, Pt. I., ed. by Dr. Louis Finkelstein (Marcus, Breslau; subscription price for the first part RM.6).

² *Die Ordination im Methodismus* (Anker-Verlag, Bremen; R.M.3 and 3.80).

America. He has gone to the original sources, and at the same time shows how familiar he is with some of the most recent discussions in English, and the result of his work is a volume which is full of interest from beginning to end. John Wesley's nature, he shows, was not creative, and some of the most important innovations in Methodism (for example, lay-preaching) were not made by him but by others, sometimes without his knowledge or will. Wesley's deep-seated reluctance to take steps which involved separation from the Church of England accounts for his refusal to ordain his preachers until the end of his life, in spite of his conviction, gained through reading the writings of Lord King and Bishop Stillingfleet, that as a presbyter he had the right to ordain. At the same time Dr. Nuelsen thinks that Wesley's distinction between the preaching of the Word and the dispensing of the Eucharist was a burden, taken over from his Mother-Church, which he never shook off. 'To him, as to his brother Charles, it (the Supper) remained a means of grace instituted by God, in which the Living Christ is much more immediately present than in the spoken or read Word, and in which the power of the Spirit of God is efficaciously wrought upon the believer' (p. 55). This appears to be meant as a criticism, and it is fair to say that,

while it would be accepted by many Methodists, it would be differently received by others, among whom the original attitude of the Wesleys has persisted until to-day.

Dr. Nuelsen gives an interesting account of the demand for ordination in England and America, and discusses the ordinations themselves and their importance, especially in the case of Dr. Coke; he also writes an important chapter on the developments after Wesley's death. In his statement of conclusions he points out that Methodism has neither one teaching nor a uniform method of ordination. The spirit is Evangelical, but the type Catholic. In America there are separate ordinations for deacons and presbyters, but Catholic features have disappeared from the Episcopal Office. Dr. Nuelsen champions the debatable thesis that the decisive act for the life and work of a Methodist preacher is not his ordination, but his reception into full connexion with the Conference. This seems to me an unfortunate distinction, but it illustrates the spirit and tendency of the book. There can be no two opinions about the value of this scholarly investigation, based as it is upon so much wide reading and careful historical research.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

Leeds.

Contributions and Comments.

Nedabiah in the Lachish Letters.

IN Letter III. we read of a Nedabiah, who had brought a letter to Shallum from 'the prophet.' There seems to be a prevalent view among some scholars that this Nedabiah was the grandson of King Jehoiakim (see 1 Ch 3¹⁷). The writer, however, would point out that a close examination of the word translated 'grandson' in the Lachish text shows it to be עֶבֶר, 'servant,' rather than נֶכֶד, 'grandson' (as they take it to be). One has only to compare the second letter of the word with the second one of הָבֵא (at the end of the same line) to be assured that it is a ב, not a כ. The latter was generally written longer, as may be seen in the word עֶבֶר in the last line, where both letters occur together. The expression עֶבֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ was a common one, denoting a court official (cf. 2 K 22¹² =

2 Ch 34²⁰). To identify Nedabiah here with the grandson of King Jehoiakim is historically incorrect, for it is very questionable whether this grandson was even born at the time. Jeconiah, his father, was only eighteen when he ascended the throne in 597 B.C., and as he had seven sons (1 Ch 3¹⁷ R.V.), of whom Nedabiah appears to have been the youngest, it is improbable that this last one was born by the time the letters were written (586 B.C.). Indeed, it is likely that Jeconiah was still without children when he was taken to Babylon, after reigning only three months in Judah, and that some of his children were not born till thirty-seven years later when he was released from prison (561 B.C.). The names of several imply this, or at least are appropriate only to such circumstances. Cf. Pedaiah, 'Yahweh has redeemed'; Jecamiah, 'Yahweh has raised up'; Hoshama, 'Yahweh has heard.' The trans-

lation 'grandson,' besides being incorrect epigraphically and historically, also strains the text, for the expression 'grandson of the king' makes him to be grandson of King Zedekiah, who was reigning at the time, which is not the meaning intended by those who thus translate it.

J. W. JACK.

Glenfarg.

The Use of John i. 9 in the 'Rest of the Words of Baruch.'

RECENT discoveries have given to any early use of Johannine language a fresh accumulative value. Professor Dodd, in a lecture on the 'Unknown Gospel' (*John Rylands Library Bulletin*, Jan. 1936, xx. i. 92), can argue from the new Fragment, from the peculiar use of Johannine passages in that Gospel, and from references in Basilides, Valentinus, and Theodotus the Valentinian from A.D. 120 to the middle of the second century, that in Egypt at least the Fourth Gospel 'seems to have leapt into favour as soon as it appeared.' Dr. Rendel Harris recalls an instance from Palestine soon after A.D. 136, 137. Over forty-five years ago he published a treatise on the Christian Apocalypse known as the *Paralipomena of Jeremiah*, or the *Rest of the Words of Baruch*, and called attention to a 'quotation' there of Jn 1⁹, but in 1889 such an early use of the Fourth Gospel found little acceptance, and was ascribed to later interpolation or correction.

As the first half of the second century moved on, the Jewish mind was drawing an expectant parallel between the First Captivity and the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The sixty-six years of Abimelech's sleep gives the year A.D. 136, the approximate date of the edict of Hadrian, by which, after the rebellion of Bar Cochba, all Jews, except apparently Christians who took no part in the rebellion, were banished from Jerusalem. Several other incidents, allegorically described in the Apokalypse—the parting of the ways between the Synagogue and the Church, the offer of a 'return from captivity' to those Judæo-Christians and others who should accept the test of baptism, the position of those who refused, and at the same time could not be received back into the Synagogue, and the consequent rise of the Ebionite sect about this time—all fit in with this period of A.D. 136–140. The writer is a Palestinian Jew familiar with the environs

of the Holy City, e.g. the caves in the Kedron valley, and the gardens of Agrippa that could be reached by a choice of two roads.

The 'quotation' of Jn 1⁹ occurs in a prayer of adoration in 9³: ἅγιος ἅγιος, ἅγιος, τὸ θυμίαμα τῶν δένδρων τῶν ζώντων, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀλήθινον τὸ φωτίζον με (τὸ φωτίζον for ὃ φωτίζει is the way in which the passage is quoted in Eus. *Dem.* 254^b). The words are found not only in the Greek, which has at many points undergone some correction, but also in the Ethiopic which is often closer to the original form of the Apocalypse. And this is by no means the only parallel with Johannine thought and language: we find in the same chapter, v. 13, 'the Son of God, Jesus Christ, the Light of all ages, the unquenchable Lamp, the Life of the faith'; v. 18, 'arrayed (κεκοσμημένον, in the Ethiopic "sent") by the Father, and coming into the world'; 4⁸, ἡμεῖς δὲ ζωὴν οὐχ ἔξετε; 12¹⁷, γέγονε δὲ τοῦτο ἵνα πιστεῦσωσιν.

C. A. PHILLIPS.

Bournemouth.

Proverbs xxvii. 10.

PR 27¹⁰ in our EVV. consists of three lines, which is contrary to most of the book and is scarcely likely to be correct. One suggestion is to remove 10^b as an insertion from the margin, leaving a couplet which gives fair sense. I would suggest, however, that we might make two couplets, that after רֵצִי, 'thine own friend,' a verb, e.g. 'cherish' ought to be inserted, giving us the message, 'Have your friends, but do not throw overboard the man who proved himself a good friend to your father.' Was not that Rehoboam's mistake which cost him the greater half of his kingdom? 10^{b, c} would then be a couplet meaning that a brother's is not the only house to which one can go in trouble, and a neighbour who is close at hand can be of more assistance than a brother who is far away. This avoids any contradiction with 17¹⁷.

W. J. MASSON.

Edinburgh.

'Until the day break, and the shadows flee away.'

DR. BUCHANAN BLAKE's interpretation of these words in the Song of Songs 2¹⁷ and 4⁶, which appears

in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, October, 1935, p. 45, is unquestionably correct, but it hardly goes beyond what the writings of Hitzig, Graetz, Rothstein, Feilchenfeld, and others have already made familiar.

That the passages in question have commonly, but erroneously, been thought to refer to the dawn is due, of course, to the A.V. translation of פָּצַח by 'break.' The rendering of the R.V. 'be cool' is far preferable, and clearly points the way to the correct interpretation of the passages. 'To be cool,' however, is not the original meaning of the Hebrew word; originally it meant 'breathe'¹ (so the Septuagint διαπνεύσῃ and Vulgate *aspiret* in both passages).² 'Until the day breathes' is then an Oriental poet's way of referring to the end of the day—to the time when the day, lifeless and heavy in its oppressive heat, begins to breathe, its cool breath heralding the approach of evening. A similar connexion in thought between breathing and growing cool is found not only in Hebrew, but also in the cognate roots in Syriac and Arabic. In Syriac the root, besides meaning *exhalare fecit, spiravit*, bears also the meaning *refrigeravit, recreavit*³; while in Arabic we have the phrase *faha al-harru*, 'the heat is allayed or assuaged,'⁴ literally 'the heat breathes,' i.e. grows cool.⁵

A comparison of the three roots in Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic thus shows that the connexion in thought between breathing and growing cool was common to the Semitic mind, and not peculiar to the Hebrew mode of thinking. This fact lends additional and valuable support to the interpretation favoured by Dr. Blake and his predecessors. The poet is thinking of the close of the day when the refreshing evening breeze blows, and when the shadows cast by the setting sun gradually withdraw themselves and finally disappear. In similar language did Jeremiah write of the day's decline

when 'the shadows of the evening are stretched out' (64).

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Durham.

Cardinal Newman.

IN view of the article 'Cardinal Newman: Almost a Critic,' which appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for August 1935, it might interest some readers to learn Newman's views on the other great question agitating the theological world in the 'sixties, namely, that of Evolution. Newman summarized his position with regard to this question in a note dated December 9th, 1863, less than a year before the letter of Dean Stanley mentioned in the article. 'There is,' he wrote, 'as much want of simplicity in the idea of the creation of distinct species as in that of the creation of trees in full growth whose seed is [in] themselves, or of rocks with fossils in them. I mean that it is as strange that monkeys should be so like men with no historical connexion between them, as the notion that there should be no course of history by which fossil bones got into rocks. The one idea stands to the other, as fluxions to differentials. Differentials are fluxions with the condition of time eliminated. I will either go the whole hog with Darwin, or, dispensing with time and history altogether, hold not only the theory of distinct species, but also of the creation of fossil-bearing rocks. If a minute was once equivalent to a million years now relatively to the forces of nature, there would be little difference between the two hypotheses. If time was not, there would be none, if the work of creation varied as to F.T., force being indefinitely great as time was indefinitely small.' This note was first published by myself in the *Dublin Review* for July 1934. It is hardly necessary to add that Newman would have looked with favour on the evolutionary theory only when applied to man considered merely as an animal.

HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON.

The Oratory, Birmingham.

¹ Hebrew and English Lexicon of the O.T., ed. by Brown, Driver, and Briggs, 806; see R.V.m., which, however, retains 'break' as alternative.

² The Syriac version renders 'grow cool.'

³ R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, ii. 3053. In Neo-Syriac, too, the root means *frigidus fuit* or *factus est* (ib. 3054).

⁴ Lane, *Arabic and English Lexicon*, 2456.

⁵ The phrase לֵירוֹחַ הַיּוֹם, 'at the cool of the day' (Gn 3^d), so often compared with the words of the song, means literally 'at the breath of the day.' For the original meaning of מָרָא, see Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *op. cit.*, 924; similarly in Syriac and Arabic (Payne Smith, 3851; Lane, 1181).

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.